Bartosz Adamczewski

Retelling the Law

Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy

European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

PETER LANG
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Retelling the Law

European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

Vol. 1

PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

Bartosz Adamczewski

Retelling the Law

Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy

PETER LANG
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

This publication is funded by the Ministry of Science
and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland
as part of the National Programme for the Development
of the Humanities (project no. 31H 11 0083 80).
This publication reflects the views only of the author,
and the Ministry cannot be held responsible for any use
which may be made of the information contained therein.

ISSN 2192-1857
ISBN 978-3-653-01681-9 (E-Book)
DOI 10.3726/978-3-653-01681-9
ISBN 978-3-631-63034-1 (Print)

www.peterlang.de

Acknowledgments

I thank my dear Mother, Jolanta Adamczewska, MSc; my Diocese of Warszawa-Praga; and the community of the Catholic Parish of St Mark in Warsaw for their encouragement and spiritual support during my writing this book.

I would also like to thank my students in the Faculty of Theology at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, who by their thought-provoking questions helped me to clarify some of the ideas which are contained in this book.

My thanks also go to the staff of the Tübingen University Library for their help during my summer bibliographical research.

Last but not least, I want to thank Mr. Łukasz Gałecki and the members of the staff of the Publisher who helped turn the electronic version of the text into a book.

Contents

Introduction

The procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier writings in later ones is one of the most important procedures which were adopted in the process of the composition of biblical writings.[1]

My earlier analyses have revealed that the sophisticated literary technique of highly creative and, on the other hand, consistently sequential reworking of an earlier text in a later one was followed in at least twelve writings of the New Testament (Rom, Gal, Mk, Lk, Eph, 2 Thes, Acts, 2 Pet, Hebr, Rev, Mt, and Jn).[2] Moreover, I have already suggested that this procedure was used in the process of the composition of the book of Genesis on the literary basis of the book of Deuteronomy.[3] In the present book, I would like to analyse the use of the procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier texts in the whole Pentateuch and in the books of Samuel and Kings, which may be regarded as the most important ones among the so-called historical books of the Old Testament.

The analyses of the hypertextual relationships which may be traced between various historical books of the Old Testament were already carried out by numerous scholars, even if they did not refer to the concept of hypertextuality.[4] For

---

1 For a definition of the literary phenomenon of hypertextuality, see G. Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Seuil: [*s.l.*] 1982), 13: '*Hypertextualité* [:] J'entends par là toute relation unissant un texte B (que j'appellerai *hypertexte*) à un texte antérieur A (que j'appellerai, bien sûr, *hypotexte*) sur lequel il se greffe d'une manière qui n'est pas celle du commentaire.' Cf. also B. Adamczewski, *Constructing Relationships, Constructing Faces: Hypertextuality and Ethopoeia in the New Testament Writings* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011), 11-13.

2 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 116. Cf. also id., *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 227-439; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 83-132; id., *The Gospel of the Narrative 'We': The Hypertextual Relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 39-121.

3 Cf. id., *Constructing*, 17-18. Cf. also id., 'Hypertextuality in the Bible: The Case of Genesis and Deuteronomy', *PJBR* 10 (2011), no. 1 (19) (in press).

4 See K. Nielsen, 'Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible', in A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø (eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (VTSup 80; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2000), 17-31; M. Fishbane, 'Types of Biblical Intertextuality', in A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø

example, Calum M. Carmichael has argued that the apparently chaotic arrangement of laws in Deuteronomy may be explained by pointing to clusters of topics in Genesis[5] because, in his opinion, the laws and at times narratives of Exodus-Deuteronomy are based on the legal issues which are referred to in the narrative portions of Genesis-2 Kings.[6] However, his intertextual analyses do not adequately explain the order of the laws in Exodus-Deuteronomy. For example, the Jewish scholar has argued that the law of Deut 24:1-4 is based on the event described in Gen 20 because of their common spatial location,[7] and the law of Deut 24:8-9 is based on the event described in Num 12:1-15 because of their common temporal location.[8] Therefore, Carmichael's theory evidently does not

---

(eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*, 39-44; G. D. Miller, 'Intertextuality in Old Testament Research', *CBR* 9.3 (2011) 283-309.

5 See C. M. Carmichael, *The Laws of Deuteronomy* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1974). Cf. also id., *Women, Law, and the Genesis Traditions* (Edinburgh University: Edinburgh 1979) (esp. 3).

6 See id., 'The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual', *VT* 50 (2000) 167-182 (here: 169): 'The issues raised in biblical rules are those that lie before us in the narrative portions of Genesis-2 Kings. Bringing to bear on these issues his own ethical and legal thinking, the anonymous lawgiver proceeded to invent his nation's ancient laws. […] A major determinant of the lawgiver's procedure was his desire to seek out and evaluate the first occurrence of a problem in the nation's history, one invariably idiosyncratic in nature, and address a similar, less idiosyncratic problem that might arise in the future.' Cf. also id., *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1985); id., *The Spirit of Biblical Law* (University of Georgia: Athens, Ga. · London 1996); id., 'Joseph, Moses, and the Institution of the Israelite Judicature', in J. E. Coleson and V. H. Matthews (eds.), *"Go to the Land I Will Show You"*, Festschrift D. W. Young (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 1996), 15-25; id., 'The Sabbatical/Jubilee Cycle and the Seven-Year Famine in Egypt', *Bib* 80 (1999) 224-239; id., 'The Three Laws on the Release of Slaves (Ex 21,2-11; Dtn 15,12-18; Lev 25,39-46)', *ZAW* 112 (2000) 509-525; id., *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in the Light of Biblical Narratives* (The John Hopkins University: Baltimore, Md. 2006); id., 'David at the Nob Sanctuary', in A. G. Auld and E. Eynikel (eds.), *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel* (BETL 232; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2010), 201-212.

7 The scholar suggests that the law of Deut 24:1-4 is based on the event which is described in Gen 20 because both texts are narratively located in the region of Kadesh, and consequently the lawgiver simply 'takes up the matter of a wife's release from her marital bond' from Gen 20: id., *Spirit*, 16-18 (here: 18).

8 The scholar suggests that that the law of Deut 24:8-9 is based on the event which is described in Num 12:1-15 because the lawgiver 'imagined Moses looking back […] on

explain the reasons for placing Deut 24:8-9 after Deut 24:1-4 and not vice versa, and consequently it offers nothing more than a simple combination of thematically related legal and narrative texts in the Hebrew Bible.

For this reason, other scholars, like John Van Seters[9] and Duane L. Christensen,[10] have argued that the direction of literary dependence between the books of the Pentateuch is in fact reversed, namely that Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are generally literarily dependent on Deuteronomy, and not vice versa.

It is therefore evident that in order to solve the problem of the existence and direction of literary, especially hypertextual, relationships among various historical and prophetic writings of the Old Testament, the method of critical-intertextual research has to be adopted. In the case of the Pentateuch and of the historical books of the Old Testament, this method has to include, among others, (*a*) using relatively reliable criteria for ascertaining the existence and direction of direct literary dependence between the Old Testament writings; (*b*) taking into due consideration the objective, i.e. uninfluenced by the biblical writings, points of reference (archaeological data, non-Israelite historical writings, etc.) for analysing the Old Testament writings from a historical-literary point of view; (*c*) taking into due consideration ancient literary-rhetorical procedures followed in the process of composition of socially significant texts (narrative illustration of cultural values, paradigmatic explanation of social taboos, etc.) and reworking of earlier, widely known texts (emulation of traditional myths and stories, ethopoeic characterization of legendary heroes, use of oracles and prophecies for justifying political-legal rules, adaptation of codified laws, etc.); (*d*) avoiding simplistic explanations which postulate the existence of some purely hypothetical sources and redactional strata (the Yahwistic source, the priestly redaction, etc.); and (*e*) avoiding simplistic reconstructions of the *Sitz im Leben* of the

---

events during his lifetime (for example, in Deut. xxiv 8, 9, the leprous disease that afflicts his sister Miriam) […]. Only on matters that occur in Moses' own time, Miriam's affliction, for example, might the lawgiver actually mention the occasion that inspires a law': id., 'Origin', 169.

9 J. Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1992); id., *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1994).

10 D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (WBC 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001), xiii; id., *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2002), xiv.

historical texts of the Old Testament (the so-called Josianic reform etc.) with the use of the procedure of mirror-reading.[11]

It seems that the most important criterion for ascertaining the existence of a literary, especially hypertextual, relationship between the biblical works is the criterion of order. If two given works reveal thematic correspondences which follow a sequential pattern, it is reasonable to suppose that the author of one of these works hypertextually reworked the other work, preserving the basic sequence of its themes, ideas, and at least selected literary motifs.[12] This basic criterion is reinforced with the criterion of a systematic use of a source, which points to cases in which all or most of the source text was in some way used in the later text, and consequently the later text may be regarded as a systematic reworking of the earlier work.[13]

By definition, hypertextuality is not based on verbatim repetition of the wording of the hypotext. For this reason, the research on hypertextuality should not be limited to the study of rather literal use of a given earlier text in a later text, but it should consist in looking for common (but, on the other hand, creatively transformed) literary themes, ideas, and motifs of both texts, and only additionally in detecting common wording.[14] Moreover, in the case of a truly

---

11 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 10-11. For examples of the use of the method of critical-intertextual research in the study of the New Testament, see id., *Q or not Q?*, 187-447; id., *Heirs*, *passim*; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 33-128.

12 Cf. D. P. Wright, *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi* (Oxford University: New York 2009), 347; B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 231-232; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 43, 119; id., *Constructing*, 13.

13 Cf. M. Pfister, 'Konzepte der Intertextualität', in U. Broich, M. Pfister, and B. Schulte-Middelich (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 35; Max Niemeyer: Tübingen 1985), 1-30 (esp. 28: 'Kriterium der Strukturalität […] während wir uns in dem Maße dem Zentrum maximaler Intensität nähern, in dem ein Prätext zur strukturellen Folie eines ganzen Textes wird'); T. L. Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary* (Oxford University: New York [et al] 2001), 429; B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 13.

14 Cf. S. Holthuis, *Intertextualität: Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (Stauffenburg Colloquium 28; Stauffenburg: Tübingen 1993), 91-94, 140-147, 214-215 (esp. 145: 'Nicht selten […] sind [komplexe Texttransformationen] damit zu verstehen als komplexe "Umdeutungen" oder "semantische Re-Interpretationen", die allenfalls dem Postulat einer "bedeutungskompatiblen" Transformation folgen'); T. L. Brodie, *Genesis*, 424-429.

hypertextual relationship between two given texts, a high degree of literary creativity and imagination on the part of the author of the hypertext should be allowed for.[15]

In fact, numerous biblical writings were composed with the use of the procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier texts. In these cases, the order of at least selected themes, ideas, motifs, and vocabulary of the hypotext is generally preserved in the hypertext. This basic rule helps to discover less evident correspondences between the structurally matching fragments of both works, even if some of these correspondences are quite remote from a purely semantic-philological point of view, and for this reason they are difficult to demonstrate in isolation from the more evident ones.[16]

From among various other criteria which may help ascertain the existence of a literary, especially hypertextual, relationship between two given biblical works, several seem to be particularly useful: (*a*) accessibility (if it may be argued that the earlier work could be known to the writer of the later text), (*b*) analogy (if there are other examples of such intertextual relationships in the same literary milieu), (*c*) density (if the thematic and possibly also linguistic[17] correspondences between the two writings are numerous enough to suggest a literary relationship between them), (*d*) distinctiveness (if there are some literary features which may be found only in the corresponding sections of the respective writings), and (*e*) explanatory capability (if the hypothesis of the existence of a literary relationship between the two writings helps to clarify their meaning).[18]

Once the existence of a direct literary, especially hypertextual, relationship between two given writings is established, some criteria for ascertaining the direction of literary dependence between these writings have to be applied. In

15 Cf. T. L. Brodie, *Genesis*, 429-431.

16 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 13-14.

17 In the research on hypertextuality, analyses of linguistic correspondences mainly concerns correspondences which occur on the level of diction (the choice of words, phrases, etc.), and not necessarily semantics, of the analysed texts.

18 Cf. K. L. Sparks, '*Enūma Elish* and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism', *JBL* 126 (2007) 625-648 (esp. 628-629); B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 231-232; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 119-120.

numerous cases, this direction is far from evident.[19] In such cases, the analyses should be based on the use of the relatively reliable, deductive criteria of (*a*) the presence of conflations of originally independent motifs, phrases, etc. which are contained in other literary works; (*b*) the presence of the vocabulary, phraseology, motifs etc. which are typical of the other work and which occur only in the passages that are structurally paralleled in that other work; (*c*) the presence of not easily perceivable inconsistencies, logical errors, and somewhat surprising features in the passages which are structurally paralleled in the other work, in which the inconsistency, error, or surprising feature in question is absent; and (*d*) preferring literary dependence on extant works to that on merely hypothetical ones.[20]

Understandably, none of these criteria is absolutely convincing in itself. Otherwise, the problems of literary relationships among the Old Testament writings would have been solved centuries ago. Consequently, the results of the analyses which are carried out with the use of these criteria have to be taken comprehensively, with the awareness that some not easily explicable exceptions to the rules may always be found. Moreover, the above-defined criteria have to be used in a responsible way, with taking into consideration both their argumentative strengths and their limitations. Accordingly, the criteria should not be applied in a mechanical way. They cannot replace good, logical, exegetical reasoning. However, they may clarify the assumptions which are made in such reasoning, and consequently they may help evaluate its results.[21]

The following analyses are not intended to be a well-written, full-scale commentary on the Pentateuch and on the historical books of the Old Testament. They constitute a detailed, technical analysis of the sequential hypertextual rela-

---

19 See A. Schofield, 'Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 *Serekh* Copies', *DSD* 15 (2008) 96-120 (esp. 99-103); B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 21-185; id., *Heirs*, 28-30; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 13-33.

20 Cf. J. Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2007), 152-153; M. Zehnder, 'Building on Stone? Deuteronomy and Esarhaddon's Loyalty Oaths (Part 1): Some Preliminary Observations', *BBR* 19 (2009) 341-374 (esp. 357-358); B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 196-202, 204; id., *Heirs*, 31-32, 41; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 34-38, 121. The four criteria which are used by M. A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code* (LHBOTS 507; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009), 61-66 are not refined enough, and therefore they are in fact reversible.

21 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 205; id., *Narrative 'We'*, 36-37.

tionships which may be traced among the books of the Hebrew Bible.[22] Moreover, in the following analyses only selected secondary works will be referred to, because even a bibliography of works which are more or less directly related to the intertextual relationships between various fragments of the Pentateuch and of Samuel-Kings would exceed the limits of one readable book.

---

22 For arguments for dividing the Pentateuch into three main units: Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Deuteronomy, see C. Houtman, *Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung* (CBET 9; Kok Pharos: Kampen 1994), 424-427; H. L. Koorevaar, 'The Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, and the Macro-Structural Problem of the Pentateuch', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (BETL 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 423-453.

Chapter 1: Deuteronomy as an Israelite sequential hypertextual reworking of Ezekiel

The book of Deuteronomy contains several references to prophetism and prophets. In particular, its main hero, Moses, is referred to as a prophet (Deut 18:15.18) who enjoyed a special relationship with Yahweh face to face (Deut 34:10). General indebtedness of the ideas of Deuteronomy to those of Israelite and Judaean prophets, especially Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, has already been noticed.[1] However, the relationship between Deuteronomy and the prophetic writings may also be traced on the literary level. In fact, the sequence of the main themes and motifs of Deuteronomy to some extent resembles that of the book of Ezekiel.[2] This fact suggests that the particular, somewhat surprising literary and thematic structure of Deuteronomy to a considerable degree originates from a sequential hypertextual reworking of the book of Ezekiel.[3]

---

1 Cf. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1991), 44-50; G. Braulik, 'Ezechiel und Deuteronomium: Die "Sippenhaftung" in Ezechiel 18,20 und Deuteronomium 24,16, unter Berücksichtigung von Jeremia 31,29-30 und 2 Könige 14,6', *BZ*, NF 44 (2000) 206-232 (esp. 218-228, 231-232) [also in id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und seiner Nachgeschichte* (SBAB 33; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2001), 171-201 (esp. 185-196, 200-201)]; P. N. Tarazi, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, vol. 1, *Historical Traditions* (rev. edn., St Vladimir's Seminary: Crestwood, NY 2003), 57-58. Cf. also J. H. Choi, *Traditions at Odds: The Reception of the Pentateuch in Biblical and Second Temple Literature* (LHBOTS 518; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 103-104, 238-239, 243. See also C. Houtman, *Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung* (CBET 9; Kok Pharos: Kampen 1994), 332-342.

2 The structure of the book of Ezekiel, with its variegated chronological-spatial references, is evidently very complex. For a recent analysis of the structure of the book of Ezekiel on the chronological-literary level, see T. D. Mayfield, *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel* (FAT 2.43; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010), esp. 77-124.

3 In the following chapters, only selected references to the hypotexts, namely the references which illustrate the phenomenon of sequential hypertextual reworking of the hypotext in the hypertext, will be given. Other references to the respective hypotexts may be found in the exegetical literature.

1.1 Yahweh's words to the one 'born' (Deut 1:1-5; cf. Ezek 1-3)

The introduction to Deuteronomy, which is narratively situated in the wilderness east of the land of Israel (Deut 1:1-5), originates from a hypertextual reworking of the introductory section of the book of Ezekiel, which is likewise situated in the exile east of the land of Israel (Ezek 1-3).

The introductory section of the book of Ezekiel (Ezek 1-3) refers to Yahweh's words (דברים) which were directed to (אל) the priest Ezekiel, and through him to the house of Israel (ישׂראל: Ezek 3:4), that is to the sons of Israel (אל־בני ישׂראל: Ezek 2:3), in the eastern, Gentile land (בארץ) of the Chaldeans by the River Chebar (Ezek 1:3). The author of Deuteronomy opened his work in a similar way, by referring to Yahweh's words which were directed to all Israel, that is to the sons of Israel, through the agency of the priestly character of Moses (Deut 1:3; cf. 9:9-10:5 etc.) in the eastern, Gentile (cf. Ashtaroth: Deut 1:4) land of Moab beyond the Jordan (Deut 1:1.5). The temporal setting of the introductory section of the book of Ezekiel (Ezek 1-3) is given with great precision: 'Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year (ויהי בשׁלשׁים שׁנה), in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month (לחדשׁ)' (Ezek 1:1). The action of the introductory section of Deuteronomy (Deut 1:1-5) is dated with similar precision, which is narratively surprising in the context of thirty-eight years of travel (cf. Deut 2:14): 'Now it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month' (Deut 1:3).[4]

Moreover, in his hypertextual reworking of the book of Ezekiel, the author of Deuteronomy replaced the semantically imprecise term 'son of man' (Ezek 2:1 etc.) with the etymologically likewise imprecise name Moses (Deut 1:1; cf. Mi 6:4; Jer 15:1), which in Egyptian means 'child' or 'born'.[5] Similarly, the pre-

---

4 Cf. L. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium* [Dtn 1,1-18] (BKAT 5/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990), 5; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (WBC 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001), 14; T. Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (ATD 8,1; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004), 11.

5 Cf. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner [et al.], *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, vol. 1 (3rd edn., E. J. Brill: Leiden · New York · Köln 1995), s.v. משׁה; M. Görg, 'Mose – Name und Namensträger: Versuch einer historischen Annäherung', in E. Otto (ed.), *Mose: Ägypten und das Alte Testament* (SBS 189; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2000), 17-42 (esp. 19-28); T. A. G. Hartmann, 'Mose und Maria –

viously unknown name Horeb (חרב), which refers to the place of Yahweh's initial revelation (Deut 1:2; cf. 1:6 etc.), most probably alludes to Ezekiel's idea of Jerusalem as laid waste (חרב: Ezek 6:6; 26:2 etc.).

1.2 Israel's 'original sin' and the forty-year-long exile of the sinful Israelites in the wilderness (Deut 1:6-2:1; cf. Ezek 4-24)

The subsequent section Deut 1:6-2:1, which narratively refers to the events that took place in Judaea, and which describes the 'original sin' of the Israelites and their ensuing forty-year-long exile in the wilderness (cf. Deut 1:3; 2:7; 8:2.4; 29:4), is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the second part of the book of Ezekiel (Ezek 4-24), which refers to the 'original sin' of the Judaeans (and the Israelites) and to their ensuing forty-year-long exile (esp. Ezek 4:6).

In particular, the motif of leaving the mountain of the divine revelation (Deut 1:6-8) originates from Ezek 10:1-22; 11:22-12:7. The subsequent motif of judging (שפט) the sinful Israelites at the border of their land (Deut 1:9-46; esp. 1:16) was probably borrowed from Ezek 11:9-11 (cf. 5:10.15; 20:36 etc.; cf. also 44:24). The motif of Judaea as once inhabited by the Amorites (Deut 1:19-20.27.44; cf. 1:7) was borrowed from Ezek 16:3.45. The related motif of vine and its grapes (Deut 1:24-25), which became the occasion to the 'original sin' (חטא) of the older generation of the Israelites (Deut 1:26-41; esp. 1:41), originates from Ezek 14:12-19:14 (esp. 16:51-52).

The thought that the old generation of the Israelites rebelled (מרה) against Yahweh and would not to listen (לא + אבה + שמע) to him in the wilderness (Deut 1:26.43) was borrowed from Ezek 20:8.13 (cf. 5:6; 20:21). The subsequent image of Yahweh swearing that he will not bring the old generation of the Israelites to the glorious land which he swore to give to their forefathers (הארץ + אשר + 'I swore' + לתת + לאבתיכם: Deut 1:34-35) originates from Ezek 20:15.42 (cf. 11:15.17; 47:14; cf. also 37:25: 'to Jacob').[6] The motif of Yahweh's promise

---

»Amuns Kind und Liebling« – Auf den ägyptischen Spuren zweier Biblischen Namen', *ZAW* 116 (2004) 616-620 (esp. 617).

6 In the book of Ezekiel, the references to Abraham (Ezek 33:24) and Jacob (Ezek 20:5; 28:25; 37:25; 39:25) are not yet combined into a fixed literary formula (cf. Deut 1:8). For a similar prophetic refrence to Isaac, see Am 7:9.16.

that a future generation will enter the land of Canaan (Deut 1:36.38-39) originates from Ezek 20:39-42. The subsequent motif of a shameful defeat (Deut 1:41-46) was borrowed from Ezek 21-24 (esp. 22:5; 23:25-26.46-47; 24:8).

1.3 Israel's return to Canaan, and its being more numerous and more powerful than its neighbours (Deut 2:2-23; cf. Ezek 25-36)

The subsequent, somewhat surprising description of Israel's return towards Canaan and of its being more numerous and more powerful than its neighbours Edom, Moab, and Ammon (Deut 2:2-23; esp. 2:4-7)[7] is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the prophetic oracles against foreign nations (Ezek 25-32; 35), in particular against Ammon, Moab, and Edom (Ezek 21:33-37; 25:1-14; 35:1-15), and of the related, prophetic promises that the Israelites will become more numerous and more prosperous than other nations (Ezek 34; 36; esp. 36:5-11.33-38).

The particular motif of numerous terrifying giants who once inhabited the lands of Moab and Ammon (Deut 2:10-11.20-21) originates from the motif of delivering these lands to the powerful sons of the east (Ezek 25:4.10).

1.4 New, innocent generation of one, powerful, militant Israel (Deut 2:24-3:22; cf. Ezek 37-39)

The idea of a new, innocent generation of one, powerful, militant Israel (Deut 2:24-37; cf. 2:16) originates from Ezek 37 (esp. 37:10). The subsequent description of Israel's theoretically defensive war against Og (עוג), who was a powerful, half-legendary king of the northern region of Bashan (Deut 3:1-22; esp. 3:1-3.11.13),[8] originates from Ezekiel's prophecy against the militant Gog (גוג),[9] the

---

7 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2004), 38.

8 It should be noted that in the narrative logic of Deuteronomy, which presents the Israelites' allegedly direct and intentionally peaceful way from the wilderness of Seir to the land of Moab and thereafter, through the plain of Jericho, to the land of Canaan (Deut 2:4-37; 34:1-6), there is no justification for the Israelites' war in the northern Transjordanian territory of Bashan (Deut 3:1-11). Cf. M. Geiger, *Gottesräume: Die literarische*

powerful, half-legendary chief prince of the northern regions of Meshech and Tubal (Ezek 38-39). The related motif of taking spoil and plundering (שׁלל + בזז: Deut 3:7) was borrowed from Ezek 39:10 (cf. also 38:12-13).[10] The somewhat surprising image of Og's great and resistant bed or sarcophagus, located east of the Jordan (Deut 3:11), originates from Ezek 39:11.

1.5 Vision of Canaan, its temple, and its theocratic laws (Deut 3:23-32:52; cf. Ezek 40:1-47:12)

The main part of Deuteronomy (Deut 3:23-32:52) is a result of a reworking of the ideas of the subsequent section of the book of Ezekiel (Ezek 40:1-47:12).

In particular, the motif of Moses seeing (ראה) the land of Canaan from the eastern land of the exile only in an exceptional, personal vision on a high mountain, a vision which should have been mediated in the form of an instruction to all Israel remaining at a distance in a valley (Deut 3:23-5:33; 32:48-52; cf. 34:1-4), originates from Ezek 40:1-5 (cf. 43:1-12). The motifs of priesthood

---

und theologische Konzeption von Raum im Deuteronomium (BWANT 176; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2010), 90-91.

9 The change of the name Gog to 'Og, which involves the change of only the first (quasi-guttural) consonant, is an example of internymic deviation. For a detailed description of this procedure, which is characteristic of many intentionally hypertextual writings, see W. G. Müller, 'Interfigurality: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures', in H. F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (Research in Text Theory: Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 1991), 101-121 (esp. 104-105). Cf. also B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 238 n. 35, 257 n. 87, 263 n. 107; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 99.

10 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 54; T. Veijola, 'King Og's Iron Bed (Deut 3:11) – Once Again', in P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint*, Festschrift E. Ulrich (VTSup 101; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2006), 60-76; E. Otto, 'Deuteronomiumstudien I. Die Literaturgeschichte von Deuteronomium 1-3', *ZABR* 14 (2008) 86-236 (esp. 195) [also as id., 'Deuteronomium 1-3 als Schlüssel der Pentateuchkritik in diachroner und synchroner Lektüre', in id., *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Schriften* (BZAR 9; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 284-420 (esp. 391)].

(Deut 9:7-10:11) and only one legitimate Yahweh's temple in the land of Canaan (Deut 11:29-12:31) originate from Ezek 40:5-45:12. The author of Deuteronomy, who was evidently not a Judaean (cf. Deut 33:7) but an Israelite (cf. Deut 33:13-17),[11] suggested that this ideal, pan-Israelite temple should be located not in Jerusalem (diff. Ezek 48:8-22) but in central Canaan,[12] in the region of Shechem (Deut 11:29-32 in the context of Deut 12:1-28; cf. also 27:2-8.12-13).[13]

The instructions concerning giving a tithe (Deut 14:22-29) originate from Ezek 45:13-17. The author of Deuteronomy evidently raised the value of the Israelites' obligatory offerings from one-sixtieth (Ezek 45:13), one-hundredth (Ezek 45:14), and one two-hundredth (Ezek 45:15) to one-tenth (מעשׂר: Deut 14:23.28; cf. Ezek 45:11.14). The instructions concerning Israel's festivals, especially the Passover (Deut 16:1-8), with their seven-based calculations of time (Deut 15:1-16:17), originate from Ezek 45:18-46:7.[14] The instructions concern-

---

11 Cf. É. Nodet, 'Pâque, Azymes et théorie documentaire', *RB* 114 (2007) 499-534 (esp. 522-523, 533).

12 The Deuteronomic idea that the temple should be located in central Canaan is partly justified by Ezekiel's ideas concerning the temple's location between the territories of six-seven (Ezek 48:1-7; cf. 47:13) and five tribes (Ezek 48:23-27), and concerning its location in the heart of the land, in the middle of the territories of the twelve tribes (Ezek 48:31-35; cf. 45:1-8).

13 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 232; S. L. Richter, 'The Place of the Name in Deuteronomy', *VT* 57 (2007) 342-366 (esp. 345-366). It should be noted that the Persian-period sacred precinct on Mount Gerizim was in fact constructed on the model of Ezekiel's vision of the ideal temple of Yahweh in the land of Israel (Ezek 40-46): cf. Y. Magen, H. Misgav, and L. Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (JSP 2; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2004), 6. It is possible that Shechem, with its new, strictly Yahwistic sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, in difference to the more syncretistic city of Samaria, was intended to function as the religious centre of the postexilic Israel.

14 The festival of weeks (חג שׁבעות: Deut 16:10.16) was added in Deut 16:9-12.16 to the originally Babylonian, biannual scheme of Ezek 45:18-25 as a result of an intertextual reworking of Ezekiel's reference to the festival of weeks (חג שׁבעות) of days (Ezek 45:21), a reworking which was somewhat artificially justified with the use of agricultural calculations (Deut 16:9), which do not point to any exact date in the calendar: cf. J. H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary 5; Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia · Jerusalem 1996) 156-157; T. Veijola, *Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1-16,17*, 338-339; id., 'Der Festkalender des Deuteronomiums (Dtn 16,1-17)', in E. Blum and R. Lux (eds.), *Festtraditionen*

ing civil authorities, regarded as subordinated to theocratic rules (Deut 16:18-17:20), originate from Ezek 46:8-18. The subsequent instruction concerning priests (כהנים) and eating sacrifices (Deut 18:1-8; cf. also 18:9-22) originates from Ezek 46:19-24.

The long section of various theologically justified instructions, which are partly based on Mesopotamian laws (Deut 19-26),[15] and which are regarded as a source of life (חי\חיה) for all Israel (Deut 27:1-32:47; esp. 30:6.15-16.19-20; 32:39.47; cf. also 19:4-5), is an elaborate reflection on the prophetic vision of the temple as the source of life for Israel (Ezek 47:1-12; esp. 47:9).

1.6 Ideal Israel consisting of twelve tribes (Deut 33-34; cf. Ezek 47:13-48:35)

The concluding blessings for the twelve tribes of Israel (Deut 33) originate from Ezekiel's idea of one Israel, consisting of twelve tribes, among whom the tribe of Joseph receives two portions (Ezek 47:13-48:35; esp. 47:13).

In order to include a special blessing for Levi (Deut 33:8-11; cf. Ezek 48:31), who had no portion of the land among other tribes (Deut 10:9; 18:1-2; cf. Ezek 44:18; 45:4-5), the author of Deuteronomy omitted the 'southern' tribe of Simeon (cf. Ezek 48:24.33) from Ezekiel's lists of the twelve tribes (Ezek 48:1-29.31-34). The order of the tribes in Deut 33:6-25 originates from adjusting the list Ezek 48:31-34 (diff. 48:1-29) to the more natural, south-east-to-north-west geographical order (cf. Deut 33:2).[16]

The related motif of the ideal extensions of the land of Canaan (Deut 34:1-4) was borrowed from Ezek 47:15-21.

---

in Israel und im Alten Orient (VWGT 28; Gütersloher: Gütersloh 2006), 174-189 (esp. 184-185).

15 Cf. E. Otto, 'Das Bundesbuch und der "Kodex" Hammurapi: Das biblische Recht zwischen positiver und subversiver Rezeption von Keilinschriftrecht', *ZABR* 16 (2010) 1-26 (esp. 18-20); S. Jacobs, 'Instrumental Talion in Deuteronomic Law', *ZABR* 16 (2010) 263-278 (esp. 271-278).

16 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 387.

1.7 Conclusion

The above-presented intertextual analyses have revealed that the Israelite author of Deuteronomy, who most probably composed his work already in the postexilic period, probably *c*.500 BC,[17] reworked the prophetic idea of a future, new, eternal covenant (Hos 2:20; Is 55:3; 61:8; Jer 31:31-33; 32:40; 50:5; Ezek 16:60-62; 37:26), together with the strictly monotheistic ideas of Deutero-Isaiah,[18] into a rhetorical-literary work, which describes and 'enacts' a new covenant, made by Yahweh with all Israel in the land of Moab, before the new entry to the land of Canaan (esp. Deut 28:69; 29:9-14).[19]

For this reason, the author of Deuteronomy gave his work the contents and the literary form of a stipulated covenant.[20] In particular, he supplemented Ezekiel's prophetic ideas, which concerned Yahweh's revelation, Israel's sins, the exile, the return from it, and ideal Yahwistic worship in Israel (cf. esp. Deut 1-18), with numerous detailed laws, partly of Mesopotamian origin (esp. Deut 15; 19-26), and a covenant-style conclusion (esp. Deut 27-30; cf. also Deut 31-34), which contribute to the contents and to the literary form of the new covenant.

---

17 It should be noted that the main problem of Deuteronomy, in difference to that of Ezekiel, is not the exile (Deut 1) but the entry of the Israelites to the land of Canaan, after the period of their remaining in the exile (Deut 2-34). Such ideology of national return of 'perishing Aramaeans' from the house of slavery (rhetorically identified in Deuteronomy with the power of the pharaonic Egypt, which was in fact heavily defeated by the Persian army, presumably including Israelite soldiers, in 525 BC at Pelusium, by the reed marshes [!] of the north-east Nile Delta) to the land of Israel (Deut 5:6; 11:2-7; 26:5-10 etc.) was justifiable only in the Persian period, and not under the deporting, homogenizing rule of the Assyrians and the Babylonians. Moreover, one of the main ideas of Deuteronomy is the idea of transmitting the faith of the old generation, 'visionary' faith which was based on prophecies and on the experience of the exodus from the house of slavery, to at least two future generations of the Israelites, who shall live in the land of Canaan (Deut 1:39; 4:9; 6:2 etc.), which implies that Deuteronomy was not written immediately after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire.

18 Cf. e.g. Deut 32:34-40 and Is 45:3; 47:3; 40:1; 49:13; 52:9; 54:6; 44:8.2; 49:2; 44:6; 45:5.18.21; 43:13; 49:22.

19 Cf. A. Cholewiński, 'Zur theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes', *Bib* 66 (1985) 96-111 (esp. 106-110). Cf. also G. Papola, *L'alleanza di Moab: Studio esegetico teologico di Dt 28,69-30,20* (AnBib 174; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2008), 287-314.

20 Cf. N. Lohfink, 'Bund als Vertrag im Deuteronomium', *ZAW* 107 (1995) 215-239 [also in id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur*, vol. 4 (SBAB 31; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2000), 285-309].

Deuteronomy was evidently intended to be a self-standing literary work, which referred, like the works of earlier prophets, both to the past, to the present, and to the future of Israel. However, the fact that Deuteronomy centred on the 'new covenant' prompted later writers to compose not only a literary supplement to it, which presented a 'historical' realisation of the new covenant in the land of Canaan (Josh; cf. also Judg), but also an elaborate introduction to it, which described Yahweh's first, 'historical' covenants with humanity (Gen) and with Israel (Exod-Num). These additional works somewhat obscured the fact that Deuteronomy is the first 'New Testament' in the Old Testament, which was realized not in a historical, but in a rhetorical-literary way.

Chapter 2: Genesis as an Israelite sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy

The problem of possible literary dependence between Genesis and Deuteronomy was usually addressed by the scholars in a very fragmentary way. Several scholars compared various fragments of both works, trying to ascertain the existence and direction of literary dependence between these fragments. Besides, several scholars in a general way compared the ideas of Genesis with those of Deuteronomy.[1] However, no scholar has ever performed a critical intertextual analysis of both works in their entireties.

Several factors contributed to this state of research. For centuries, the Pentateuch as a whole was regarded as having been written by Moses, and for this reason no one seriously analysed the literary relationships which could exist among its parts. In the nineteenth and twentieth century, the documentary hypothesis with its oral-traditions and redactional-stages variants dominated the research on the Pentateuch,[2] which caused the lack of interest in critical intertextual analyses of the five works of the Pentateuch in their entireties. Moreover, the stories about the patriarchs in Genesis (Gen 12-50) were for long regarded as pre-Deuteronomic, based on ancient local traditions, a fact which inhibited critical comparative analyses of their contents with the contents of Deuteronomy.

However, even a superficial comparative analysis of the sequences of themes in Genesis and Deuteronomy reveals that these sequences are closely related to each other. Of course, Genesis is quite different from Deuteronomy, both in its literary form and its theological ideas. Nevertheless, it can be demonstrated that the sequence of the main themes of Genesis greatly resembles that of Deuteronomy. Moreover, a linguistic analysis of Genesis and Deuteronomy reveals that numerous common key words and phrases occur in the thematically corresponding sections of Genesis and Deuteronomy. These facts suggest that one of these works was literarily dependent on the other. In fact, a critical inter-

---

1 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1992), 227-243.

2 See E. Zenger, 'Theorien über die Entstehung des Pentateuch im Wandel der Forschung', in id. [et al.], *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (KStTh 1,1; 7th edn., W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2008), 74-123 (esp. 88-123); L. Schmidt, 'Im Dickicht der Pentateuchforschung: Ein Plädoyer für die umstrittene Neuere Urkundenhypothese', *VT* 60 (2010) 400-420.

textual analysis of Genesis and Deuteronomy reveals that Genesis originates from a creative, hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, and not vice versa.

2.1 Initial entry to the land which was regarded by God as good, and not being alone (Gen 1-2; cf. Deut 1:1-25)

The opening account of creation of heaven and earth as good in God's eyes, placement of the man in a paradisiacal land, and the man not being alone (Gen 1-2) thematically corresponds to the opening account of Israel's entry to the Promised Land, which was regarded as good in God's eyes, and of Moses not being alone (Deut 1:1-25).

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 1-2 and Deut 1:1-25 is evidently not very close, but it is constituted by numerous common key words of the respective accounts: ארץ ('earth/land' [prepared for human dwelling]: Gen 1:1-2.10-12.15.17.20.22.24-26.28-30; 2:1.4-6.11-13; Deut 1:7-8.21-22.25), טוב ('good' [having helpers, earth/land]: Gen 1:4.10.12.18.21.25.31; 2:9.12.17-18; Deut 1:14.25), פרי ('fruit' [of the earth/land]: Gen 1:11-12.29; Deut 1:25); ברך ('bless' [resulting in multiplication]: Gen 1:22.28; Deut 1:11), רבה ('become/be numerous' [as an outcome of God's cosmic-style blessing]: Gen 1:22.28; Deut 1:10), נתתי ('I have given' [you the fertile land]: Gen 1:29; Deut 1:8), נהר ([great] 'river' [constituting the border of the earth/land]: Gen 2:10.13-14; Deut 1:7), פרת ('Euphrates' [as the utmost river]: Gen 2:14; Deut 1:7), צוה ('command' [to inherit the life-giving land]: Gen 2:16; Deut 1:19), לבד ('alone' [without any helper]: Gen 2:18; Deut 1:9.12), and לקח ('take' [helpers from the body]: Gen 2:21-23; Deut 1:15.23).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 1-2 and Deut 1:1-25 is not easy to ascertain. It may however be argued that the more particular, national ideas of Deut 1:1-25 were reworked into the universalistic ideas of Gen 1-2 with the use of several Mesopotamian literary motifs (epics of creation etc.). Moreover, it is reasonable to suppose that the text of Deut 1:1-25, which is thematically coherent as referring to the initial conquest of the Promised Land,[3]

3 Cf. J. Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1994), 371, 373-374; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2004), 15, 24-25.

influenced both Gen 1:1-2:4a and Gen 2:4b-25 (and not vice versa); otherwise, the author of Deut 1:1-25 would in some way have reflected the bipartite literary structure of Gen 1-2.

The double account of creation of the inhabitable world and of placement of humans therein (Gen 1-2) develops the ideas which are contained in the account of 'creation' of Israel in the wilderness of Horeb and of placement of Israel in the paradisiacal land of Canaan (Deut 1:6-8.19-25). The scope of creation is much more universalistic in Genesis than in Deuteronomy. In Genesis, it is not one people in its land, but all humankind on the earth, which is depicted as created by God. Moreover, it is not more 'Yahweh our/your/ancestors God' (Deut 1:6.10-11.19-21.25) but simply 'God' (Gen 1:1-12.14.16-18.20-22.24-29.31; 2:2-3) or 'Yahweh God' (Gen 2:4-5.7-9.15-16.18-19.21-22) who acts as the creator of the universe and of all humankind.

In order to express in more universalistic terms the Deuteronomic thought that the chosen people had been created and placed in the inhabitable land, the author of Genesis creatively used several literary models originating from well-known Mesopotamian works, like epics of creation of the universe and humankind (e.g. *Theogony of Dunnu* 1-5; *Enuma Elish* I 1-8, IV 136 – VI 120: cf. esp. Gen 1:1-2:4a; *Atrahasis Epic* I 21-28, 189-243: cf. esp. Gen 2:4b-15), the story about creation and humanization of a man through the agency of a woman (*Gilgamesh Epic* I 101-214: cf. esp. Gen 2:4b-7.18-25), and the story about human loss of potential immortality (*Adapa Myth* B 28-34, 57-70: cf. esp. Gen 2:16-17).[4]

Several prophetic motifs, for example that of God creating the heavens (cf. Is 42:5; 45:18), that of 'wasteland and emptiness' (תהו ובהו) of the earth remaining in darkness (cf. Jer 4:23),[5] and that of Eden (cf. Ezek 28:13; 31:9.16.18; 36:35),[6] were also used in Gen 1-2.

---

4 Cf. K. L. Sparks, '*Enūma Elish* and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism', *JBL* 126 (2007) 625-648 (esp. 629-632); H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš und Genesis 1-9', *BZ*, NF 54 (2010) 201-228 (esp. 205-211). Cf. also A. Van der Kooij, 'The Story of Paradise in the Light of Mesopotamian Culture and Literature', in K. J. Dell, G. Davies, and Y. V. Koh (eds.), *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms*, Festschrift J. Emerton (VTSup 135; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2010), 3-22.

5 The use of this motif was quite natural in its original context, which referred to desolation of Judaea (Jer 4:13.20.23-28). Cf. D. T. Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation* (JSOTSup 83; Sheffield Academic:

The bipartite literary structure of Gen 1-2 (i.e. Gen 1:1-2:4a; 2:4b-25) is a result of using such differing Mesopotamian works in order to universalize the ideas of Deut 1:1-25. Moreover, this bipartite structure reflects the narrative logic of Deut 1:1-25: the paradisiacal land existed already before the creation of Israel, but it awaited Israel's military, agricultural, and cultic activity therein. Likewise, the somewhat surprising way of calling the Deity first universally 'God' (Gen 1:1-2:3) and then, more particularly, in the context of entering the paradisiacal land, 'Yahweh God' (Gen 2:4-22)[7] reflects this Deuteronomic logic. For these reasons, the hypothesis of twofold origin of Gen 1-2 (as originating, for example, from the priestly source in Gen 1:1-2:4a and from the Yahwistic source in Gen 2:4b-25) is in fact unnecessary for explaining the literary features of this text.[8]

The interrelated motifs of (*a*) light in darkness and (*b*) night and day (Gen 1:2-4.5cd), ones which are absent in the initial sections of the Mesopotamian epics of creation, were borrowed from Deut 1:33 ('in the fire by night and in the cloud by day'). The order of first darkness/night and then light/day (Gen 1:2-4.5cd) is rather unnatural in itself (diff. e.g. Gen 1:5ab.14.16.18; *Enuma Elish* I 38, 50, 109).[9] As such, it allusively expresses the thought that the scope of the divine revelation was broadened from Yahweh's providential care of Israel in the wilderness (Deut 1:33) to God's creative, sustaining, and ordering activity in the whole universe (Gen 1:2-5).

The idea of the world as good in God's eyes (Gen 1:4.10.12.18.21.25.31; 2:9.12.17) originates from Deut 1:25 ('The land which Yahweh our God is giving us is good'). As such, it has nothing to do with a naively optimistic world

---

Sheffield 1989), 36-40. Cf. also P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis* (Chrysostom Bible; OCABS: St Paul, Minn. 2009), 31.

6 Cf. W. Chrostowski, *Ogród Eden: Zapoznane świadectwo asyryjskiej diaspory* (RoSB 1; Vocatio: Warszawa 1996), esp. 183-286; T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2007), 125; Ł. Niesiołowski-Spanò, 'Primeval History in the Persian Period?', *SJOT* 21 (2007) 106-126 (esp. 112-113, 115).

7 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26* (NAC 1A; Broadman & Holman: [*s.l.*] 1996), 192-193; H. C. Brichto, *The Names of God: Poetic Readings in Biblical Beginnings* (Oxford University: New York · Oxford 1998), 102-110; Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek: Teologia narracyjna Rdz 1-3* (RoSB 13; Vocatio: Warszawa 2003), 292-293.

8 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 188-191.

9 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17* (NICOT; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1990), 121.

view or with the philosophical idea that our world is the best of all possible worlds. It is rather an invitation to humans to perceive the created world as bearing good fruits and as being beautiful (cf. esp. Deut 1:25 and the statements which conclude the two parts of the creation diptych: Gen 1:11-12.29-31a), and consequently to glorify God as its benevolent and wise creator. For this reason, the idea that the world should be perceived as good has more to do with a calling to appreciate God's gifts than with a philosophical thesis.

In the second part of the creation diptych (Gen 1:14-31),[10] the motif of the sun, the moon, and the stars in the heavens (Gen 1:14-18) was borrowed from Deut 4:19. The related catalogue of creatures which live in the sea, in the sky, and on the earth (Gen 1:20-21.24-25) was borrowed from Deut 4:17-18 (בהמה, עוף, רמשׂ, דגה). The idea of God as creating humankind on the earth on a certain day in the first time (Gen 1:26-27) originates from Deut 4:32 (*ראשׁ, יום, ברא, אלהים, אדם, על־הארץ, השמים). The motif of male and female (זכר ונקבה: Gen 1:27) was borrowed from Deut 4:16 (cf. the earlier use of Deut 4:17-18 in Gen 1:20-21.24-25 and of Deut 4:19 in Gen 1:14-18). Accordingly, most of the second part of the creation diptych (Gen 1:14-27) is a reworking of Deut 4:16-19.32 with its theme of the prohibition of serving any figures of animated creatures and celestial bodies. The author of Genesis illustrated this particularly Israelite idea by means of depicting celestial bodies and animals as created by the sole true God the Creator, and as subordinated to him.

The image of God blessing living creatures in order that they could become numerous (Gen 1:22.28) originates from Deut 1:10-11 ('Yahweh your God has multiplied you… may Yahweh God… bless you'). As such, it broadens the scope of Yahweh's blessing, which was originally reserved for Israel, to all humankind[11] and to all animate creatures.

The thought that humankind can be regarded as 'image and likeness' of God (Gen 1:26-27) originates from the motif of Israel regarded as a son (and conse-

---

10 Cf. J. Wöhrle, '*dominium terrae*: Exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zum Herrschaftsauftrag in Gen 1,26-28', *ZAW* 121 (2009) 171-188 (esp. 178-179); D. Dziadosz, *Tak było na początku… Izrael opowiada swoje dzieje: Literacka i teologiczna analiza wiodących tradycji Księgi Rodzaju* (Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej: Przemyśl 2011), 36-37.

11 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 51.

quently, image and likeness) of God (Deut 1:31; cf. also 8:5).[12] In Genesis, the latter motif was reworked in more universalistic terms. Israel experienced its filial relationship to God thanks to Yahweh's loving care for the Israelites in the wilderness (Deut 1:31). Humankind as a whole does not share Israel's experience; however, all humans, even those who never heard about Yahweh the God of Israel, may believe in their enjoying a privileged relationship with the Creator because of their having dominion over all animals (Gen 1:26).[13]

The idea of all plants of the earth as given to humans by God (Gen 1:29) originates from Deut 1:8 ('I have given the land before you'). In such a way, the particularly Israelite experience of having been given the Promised Land may be shared by all humankind in its relationship to the generally fertile, cultivable earth.

The first part of the account of creation of the world and humankind (Gen 1:1-2:4a) concludes in the aetiology of the Sabbath (Gen 2:2-3). The word 'Sabbath' originally referred to the day of the full moon (cf. Akk. *šapattu*/*šabattu*; cf. also Hos 2:13; Am 8:5; Is 1:13).[14] Only later did the Sabbath come to be re-

---

12 For this reason, the combination of the terms 'likeness' (דמות) and 'image' (צלם) refers in Gen 5:3 to Seth as the son of Adam. Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 164, 169-171; D. Dziadosz, *Tak było*, 74.

13 The use of the term 'image' in the context of having dominion is known from Akkadian (as well as Egyptian) royal ideology, in which, for example, Esarhaddon was presented as the very image (*ṣalmu*) of the god Bel: cf. C. L. Crouch, 'Genesis 1:26-7 as a Statement of Humanity's Divine Parentage', *JTS*, NS 61 (2010) 1-15 (esp. 10-12); G. Fischer, '„… nach unserem Bild und unserer Ähnlichkeit" (Gen 1,26): Die provokante Aussage von der Erschaffung des Menschen im Horizont von Altem Testament und Altem Orient', in H. Schmidinger and C. Sedmak (eds.), *Der Mensch – ein Abbild Gottes? Geschöpf – Krone der Schöpfung – Mitschöpfer* (Typologien des Menschlichen 7; Wissenschaftliche: Darmstadt 2010), 153-175 (esp. 155-160) [also in id., *Die Anfänge der Bibel: Studien zu Genesis und Exodus* (SBAB 49; Katholisches Bibelwerk 2011), 14-36 (esp. 16-20)]. The addition of the term 'likeness' in Gen 1:26; 5:3 (cf. also 5:1) emphasizes the filial relationship of all humans to God.

14 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 142; A. Grund, *Die Entstehung des Sabbats: Seine Bedeutung für Israels Zeitkonzept und Erinnerungskultur* (FAT 75; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2011), 68-83, 92-100, 112-121, 130-132. *Pace* É. Puech, 'La requête d'un moissonneur dans le Sud-Judéen à la fin du VII[e] s. av. J.-C.', *RB* 110 (2003) 5-16 (esp. 11-12), even if the ostracon from Meṣad Ḥašavyahu ll. 5-6 refers to the day of the Sabbath as the day of rest, it does not imply that in the First Temple Period the Sabbath was observed in seven-day cycles and called *šbt*, in difference to the full moon day called *hšbt*.

garded as every seventh day (Deut 5:13-14; cf. earlier Ezek 46:1-5).[15] In Genesis, the observance of the festival is no more justified by the particular experience of Israel as having been brought out of Egypt (Deut 5:15), purportedly on the day of the full moon (Exod 12:6.14; cf. Deut 16:1), but by an easily understandable idea of the Creator's natural rest after a period of hard work (Gen 2:2-3; cf. Exod 20:11). In such a way, the particularly Israelite idea of having been freed from the slave labour in Egypt is communicated to every human who knows the value of rest after hard work.

The somewhat strange idea of humankind as created from the dust of the ground (Gen 2:7; cf. later Gen 3:19) is a reworking (with the use of traditional Mesopotamian motifs, e.g. *Atrahasis Epic* I 226, 231, 234; *Gilgamesh Epic* I 102-103)[16] of the idea of Israel as 'created' in the wilderness (Deut 1:6-7). Accordingly, the Deuteronomic idea of Israel's humble origins (cf. Deut 26:5; cf. also Am 9:7) was expressed in Gen 2:7 in more universalistic terms, with the use of the image of humble origins of all humankind.

Since the motif of the paradisiacal garden which was planted for humankind (Gen 2:8-9) illustrates the thought that Canaan was beautiful, fruitful, and prepared for Israel (Deut 1:21.25), the related motif of the tree of life which was planted in the middle of the garden (Gen 2:9) illustrates Ezekiel and Deuteronomy's thought that Yahweh's chosen place of worship should be located in the centre of Canaan (cf. Ezek 48:8-22.31-34; Deut 11:29-12:28; 27:2-8.12-13; Josh 8:30-33; 24:1-27.32).

On the other hand, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:9.17) symbolizes the borders between the Promised Land and its surroundings (both the southern border at Kadesh-barnea and the eastern border at the Jordan),[17]

---

15 Cf. A. Grund, *Entstehung*, 101-106. It should be noted that in the logic of Ezek 45:18-46:7 the Sabbath is still regarded as having its counterpart in the day of the new moon in the lunar cycle (Ezek 46:1-7; cf. 45:17), just as the festivals in the seventh month in the solar cycle have their counterparts in the New Year and in the Passover (Ezek 45:18-25). The idea of regarding the Sabbath as every seventh day may have originated from the ancient Mesopotamian custom of highlighting the importance of the first, seventh, and fifteenth day of the lunar month: see ibid. 114-116.

16 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 157-158; H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš', 206; P. J. Titus, *The Second Story of Creation (Gen 2:4-3:24): A Prologue to the Concept of Enneateuch?* (EHS 23/912; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011), 168-173.

17 *Pace* H. Pfeiffer, 'Der Baum in der Mitte des Gartens: Zum überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Ursprung der Paradieserzählung (Gen 2,4b – 3,24), Teil I: Analyse', *ZAW* 112

which are regarded in Deuteronomy as places of Israel's fundamental decisions (Deut 1:1-2.5.19-25; 9:1; 32:45-47 etc.). That is why the tree of the knowledge of good and evil symbolizes neither general human capacity of moral discrimination (which is obviously necessary for any morally relevant human decision) nor sexual awareness etc. The symbolic plant illustrates the knowledge of both sides of the border between God's life-giving space and its destructive surroundings. In this way, by means of the mythological images of a paradisiacal garden, a plant which gives immortality, and something that gives extraordinary knowledge, the author of Genesis communicated to all humans Israel's particular experiences of God-given land, Yahweh's chosen sanctuary, and fundamental religious decisions.

The strange in itself image of four great rivers, from among which Euphrates is the utmost one (Gen 2:10-14),[18] is a reworking of the Deuteronomic motif of the great river Euphrates regarded as constituting the utmost border of the Promised Land (Deut 1:7; cf. Gen 15:18), a motif which was probably conflated with the motif of Euphrates regarded as constituting one of the four ideal borders of the Promised Land (Deut 11:24; cf. Josh 1:4). Accordingly, the 'Arabian' river Pishon (Gen 2:11-12), which should most probably be related to the river of Egypt (cf. Gen 15:18) and to the 'golden' region of Di-zahab (Deut 1:1), as well as the 'Cushite' river Gihon (Gen 2:13)[19] commonly allude to the south-western ideal border of the Promised Land (including Egypt: cf. Is 19:23-25), whereas the rivers Tigris and Euphrates (Gen 2:14) commonly allude to Israel's ideal north-eastern border (including Assyria: cf. Is 19:23-25).[20]

(2000) 487-500 (esp. 491), the text of Gen 2:9 does not state that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was located in the middle of the garden. The statement Gen 3:3 presents a distorted view of reality (cf. also Gen 3:1), in which God-imposed limitation becomes the obsessive centre of human interest. Cf. K. Schmid, 'Die Unteilbarkeit der Weisheit: Überlegungen zur sogenannten Paradieserzählung Gen 2f. und ihrer theologischen Tendenz', *ZAW* 114 (2002) 21-39 (esp. 32).

18 Cf. T. Stordalen, 'Heaven on Earth – Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature', in K. Schmid and C. Riedweg (eds.), *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History* (FAT 2.34; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2008), 28-57 (esp. 43); P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 198-199, 207-211.

19 Cf. P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 207-209.

20 Cf. J. Sailhamer, 'Genesis', in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: With the New International Version of the Holy Bible*, vol. 2, *Genesis-Numbers* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1990), 1-284 (esp. 42-43); K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 208.

The idea of God's sole command which was given to humans (Gen 2:16-17) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of God's fundamental command to conquer the land which was given to Israel, and to live therein faithfully (Deut 1:3.19). This idea was expressed in Genesis in universalistic terms, with the use of the widely understandable idea of permission, given by the owner of a garden to his gardener, to eat all fruits of the garden, except one special fruit which is forbidden to him.

The motif of the man being alone, which is regarded as not good and which is remedied by giving to the man an adequate helper in the person of a woman, who is taken from his body (Gen 2:18-25), is a reworking of the motif of Moses being alone, which is presented as not good and which is remedied by giving him adequate helpers, who were taken from the body of Israel (Deut 1:9-17.23). The particular thought that Moses shared responsibility within the society was illustrated in Genesis with the use of the widely known and easily understandable Mesopotamian story about humanization of a man through the agency of a woman (*Gilgamesh Epic* I 162-214).[21] For this reason, the role of the wife as the 'helper' of her husband (Gen 2:22-23) should not be interpreted in purely patriarchal terms of managing the household, but in more spiritual terms of being wise, reputable, and righteous (cf. Deut 1:15-17), and of forming together with the husband a close, personal, intimate, and dialogical community (cf. Gen 2:18.24-25).[22] According to Gen 2:23 (diff. 2:18), only in the presence of the woman does the man begin to speak eloquently.[23]

Accordingly, the mythological-legendary features of Gen 1-2 function as the literary code with which the particularly Israelite religious ideas of Deut 1:1-25 could be reformulated into more universalistic ones and expressed in more widely known literary forms.

---

21 Cf. H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš', 207-208.

22 Cf. C. Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (Oxford University: New York · Oxford 1988), 85-86; D. Dziadosz, *Tak było*, 130.

23 Cf. P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 280-282.

2.2 The original sin of wanting to 'know good and evil' and the punishment of expulsion from the paradisiacal land (Gen 3; cf. Deut 1:26-2:1)

The subsequent account of the sin of wanting to 'know good and evil' and of the punishment of expulsion from the paradisiacal land (Gen 3) thematically corresponds to the account of the sin of the chosen people, who 'knew good and evil', and of the prohibition of entering the Promised Land (Deut 1:26-2:1).

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 3 and Deut 1:26-2:1 is not very close, but one of the key phrases of the respective accounts, namely ידע טוב ורע ('to know good and evil'), occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Deut 1:39 and Gen 3:5.22 (cf. also Gen 2:9.17: הדעת טוב ורע). This linguistic distinctiveness additionally proves the hypothesis of direct literary dependence between Gen 3 and Deut 1:26-2:1. The other key words which are common for both accounts are: ראה ('see' [exaggerating the reality]: Gen 3:6; Deut 1:28), ירא ('be afraid' [unnecessarily in God's presence]: Gen 3:10; Deut 1:29), צוה ('command' [expressing God's fundamental order]: Gen 3:11.17; Deut 1:41), and שׁוב ('return' [to the wilderness]: Gen 3:19; Deut 1:45). It is worth noting that they occur in the same relative sequence in both accounts.

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 3 and Deut 1:26-2:1 is not easy to ascertain. However, the elaboration of the more particular, national ideas of Deut 1:26-2:1 into the account of the original sin of humankind (Gen 3) is easier to imagine than the reverse hypertextual procedure. Moreover, the key phrase ידע טוב ורע ('to know good and evil') has a clear meaning in Deut 1:39 (cf. 1:35: the evil generation as opposed to the good land), whereas its meaning in Gen 3:5.22 (cf. also 2:9.17) is not easy to decipher, a fact which suggests that this phrase was borrowed from Deut 1:39 and used in Genesis in a new context.[24]

Consequently, it may be argued that the account of the sin of wanting to 'know good and evil' and of the punishment of expulsion from the paradisiacal land (Gen 3) is a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic account which de-

24 Cf. also the somewhat surprising use of the motif of the 'day' in Gen 2:17; 3:5 (ביום) and its much more natural use in Deut 1:39 (היום).

scribes the sin of the chosen people who 'knew good and evil' and the prohibition of entering the Promised Land (Deut 1:26-2:1).[25]

The Deuteronomic account Deut 1:26-2:1 has a clear function in the literary-rhetorical structure of the whole work.[26] The story alludes to the expulsion of Israel from its land (cf. also Deut 1:1.5; 4:45-49 etc.), which was presented by Israel's prophets as caused by Israel's sins, that is choosing evil instead of good (Am 5:14-27; cf. 7:16-17; Hos 9:1-6.15-17; 10:5-8). This particularly Israelite experience of having been expelled from the Promised Land because of choosing evil instead of good is presented in Genesis in more universalistic terms, with the use of several widely known literary motifs.

The literary motif of a serpent or snake was widely known in ancient Near Eastern cultures. In particular, the motif of a snake stealing away Gilgamesh's plant of rejuvenation, thus hindering Gilgamesh's quest for immortality, was known from the *Gilgamesh Epic* (XI 305-307).[27] This motif seems to have been conflated in Gen 3:1-5 with the prophetic motif of the biting serpent (הנחשׁ), a literary image which metaphorically illustrates the cause of the political-social death of the people of Israel (Am 5:19; 9:3; cf. also Jer 8:17; 46:22).[28] The use of this motif in Gen 3:1-5 may also be explained in intertextual terms: the serpent, being a 'beast of the open field' (Gen 3:1; cf. 2:20), alludes to the semi-desert place of temptation at Kadesh-barnea (Deut 1:19.31.46; cf. 8:15: נחשׁ).

The temptation to perceive God as malevolent and to perceive his beautiful gifts as for some strange reasons inaccessible to humans (Gen 3:1.3)[29] illustrates

---

25 Cf. N. Lohfink, 'Die Erzählung vom Sündenfall', in id., *Das Siegeslied am Schilfmeer: Christliche Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Alten Testament* (J. Knecht: Frankfurt am Main 1965), 81-101 (esp. 91-92). Cf. also T. N. D. Mettinger, *Eden*, 49-52, 124-125.

26 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 23-31.

27 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (WBC 1; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1987), 72-73; R. S. Hendel, 'Serpent נחשׁ', in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)* (2nd edn.; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln and William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 1999), 744-747 (esp. 744); H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš', 208.

28 It should be noted that the motif of 'the serpent' (הנחשׁ) is very abruptly introduced in Gen 3:1, as though it were already known to the recipient of the story. Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 232; Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie*, 385.

29 Cf. F. Mirguet, *La représentation du divin dans les récits du Pentateuque: Méditations syntaxiques et narratives* (VTSup 123; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 441-445; R. R. Reno, *Genesis* (BrTCB; Brazos: Grand Rapids, Mich. 2010), 85-86; D. Dziadosz, *Tak było*, 148.

the contents of Deut 1:27-28. With the use of easily understandable motifs, the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic idea that Israel's 'original sin' was based on a consciously distorted view of reality, a view in which God was regarded as hating Israel, Egypt was regarded as Israel's homeland, and the Promised Land was regarded as certainly inaccessible and a place of Israel's imminent death (Deut 1:27-28).[30] This theological idea is narratively illustrated in Gen 3:1-13 firstly by means of the introduction of the serpent and the woman's words (Gen 3:1-3), which significantly differ from the narrator's words in Gen 2:9 and God's words in Gen 2:16-17.[31] The serpent presents God as malevolent and prohibiting humans from having access to the goods of the paradisiacal land (Gen 3:1; cf. 3:4-5).[32] In response, the woman creates the image of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as located in the middle of the garden, and of herself as forbidden from even touching this tree (Gen 3:2-3),[33] thus obsessively placing the limitations and difficulties of human life in the very centre of human interest.[34]

The motif of 'knowing good and evil' (Gen 3:5.22; cf. 2:9.17) was borrowed from Deut 1:39. However, while in Deuteronomy it refers to the contrasting experience of Yahweh's manifest goodness and Israel's sinful evilness (cf. Deut 1:35),[35] in Genesis it is related to one of the fundamental human problems: the quest for autonomy in deciding what is good and what is evil.

The related idea of perceiving reality in a way which does not agree with that of God (Gen 3:5-7.10-11) originates from Deut 1:28. The author of Deuteronomy described the 'original sin' of Israel as consisting mainly in cowardice,

---

30 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 28.

31 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 188-189; Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie*, 389-392; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis* (NCBC; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2009), 65.

32 Cf. W. Chrostowski, 'Anatomia pokusy (Rdz 3,1-6)', *PrzPow* 101 (1984) vol. 243, 198-207 (esp. 204); P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 324-326, 330-331.

33 Moreover, the woman presents herself as rather reluctantly permitted by God to eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden (Gen 3:2; diff. 2:16). Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 73; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 235-236; P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 326-327.

34 Cf. Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie*, 392; F. Mirguet, *Représentation*, 448-450; P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 327.

35 In the perspective of Deut 1:39 the sons do not participate in the social life of the adult Israelites (cf. Deut 1:22-28.35-38). Consequently, 'today' they have knowledge neither of the beauty of Canaan (cf. Deut 1:25.35) nor of the sinful evilness of the Israelite society (cf. Deut 1:26-28.35).

an attitude which led to the exaggeration of firstly the Canaanites' strength and Israel's weakness (Deut 1:27-28.32) and then of the Canaanites' weakness and Israel's strength (Deut 1:41-43), which eventually resulted in Israel's shameful humiliation (Deut 1:44-45).[36] This idea is expressed in Genesis in widely understandable terms of human quest for readily accessible secret divine knowledge (Gen 3:5); women craving for delicious flavour, attractiveness, and success (Gen 3:6); and natural human shame at being naked (Gen 3:7-10).[37] The ironic description of humans as dressing loincloths made of fig leaves (Gen 3:7; diff. 3:21) may correspond to the likewise ironic description of the Israelites as chased by bees (Deut 1:44): sweet figs attract numerous insects.

The subsequent motif of being afraid in God's presence (Gen 3:10) was borrowed from Deut 1:29. In Deuteronomy, the Israelites were encouraged to have no fear when God was with them (Deut 1:29-33); they were gripped by an irrational fear in the aftermath of their sin (Deut 1:44).[38] The latter idea is illustrated in Gen 3:8.10 with the use of the image which reflects common human experience: being afraid because of one's nakedness and because of one's guilt.[39]

The idea of referring to God's one, past, fundamental command (Gen 3:11.17) originates from Deut 1:41. In Genesis, the Deuteronomic image of God as having given, at the beginning of the history of Israel, just one basic command, namely to go up and take possession of the Promised Land, and consequently to cross the border to God's realm of life (Deut 1:6-8.21.26.41), was reworked into the image of God as having given, at the beginning of the history of humankind, just one fundamental command, namely not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, a symbolic plant which marks the border between the realm of life and the realm of death (Gen 2:17; 3:3.11-12.17).[40]

The idea of shifting the blame onto the God-given 'helper' and subsequently onto the serpent (Gen 3:12-13) seems to originate from Deut 1:37. The Deuteronomic image of Moses as complaining that because of the Israelites, who were

---

36 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (WBC 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001), 34-35; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 26.

37 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 190-191; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 66; P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 331-332, 338.

38 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 26.

39 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 240-241; Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie*, 408-411; P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 356-357.

40 Cf. L. Alonso-Schökel, 'Motivos sapienciales y de alianza en Gn 2-3', *Bib* 43 (1962) 295-315 (esp. 311-312).

supposed to help him in giving right verdicts, he will not enter the Promised Land (Deut 1:37; cf. 1:9-17; cf. also 1:27)[41] has its more universalistic counterpart in Genesis in the widely understandable image of a man who tries to excuse himself by pointing to his wife and God's guilt, and the likewise understandable image of a woman who tries to excuse herself by pointing to her having been insidiously deceived (Gen 3:12-13).[42]

The motifs of God's anger and God's solemn swearing, presented as consisting in both cursing the serpent and making a hopeful promise for a future generation (Gen 3:14-15), were borrowed from Deut 1:34-39. However, the author of Genesis significantly reworked the Deuteronomic idea of God's anger against the evil generation of the Israelites (Deut 1:34-35.37.40) by transforming it into the well-known image of angrily cursing a venomous, desert snake (Gen 3:14-15).[43] On the other hand, the reworking of God's promise in Genesis is much closer in semantic terms. The promise that Caleb, Joshua, and the next, innocent generation will seize the Promised Land (Deut 1:36.38-39)[44] was reformulated into the 'protogospel' that the woman's offspring will seize the serpent's head, albeit not without difficulties (Gen 3:15; cf. 3:20).

The subsequent, related idea that the basic human tasks became very difficult (Gen 3:16-19) originates from Deut 1:41-44. The Deuteronomic image of the main task of Israel, namely the conquest of Canaan, as suddenly becoming unrealizable because of Israel's sin of distrust in God's help (Deut 1:41-44; cf. 1:32-35.40)[45] is presented in Genesis in widely understandable terms of the woman's great pain in her female task of childbearing and her futile longing for equality with her husband (Gen 3:16), as well as the man's hard toil in his male task of cultivating the land (Gen 3:17-19).[46] The related motif of plants of the wilderness ('thorns and thistles': Gen 3:18; cf. Hos 10:8) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the wilderness (Deut 2:1).

---

41 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 27, 29-30.

42 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 194; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 241-242; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 67.

43 Cf. B. U. Schipper, 'Schlangenbeschwörung in Ägypten und in Israel', in M. Pietsch and F. Hartenstein (eds.), *Israel zwischen den Mächten*, Festschrift S. Timm (AOAT 364; Ugarit: Münster 2009), 419-436.

44 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 30.

45 Cf. ibid. 30-31.

46 Cf. Z. Pawłowski, *Opowiadanie*, 419-425; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 69-71; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 66.

The well-known motif of returning to dust (Gen 3:19) originates from Deut 1:45. The prophetic-Deuteronomic thought that Israel's expulsion from its land had been caused by its own sin, a thought which was expressed in Deut 1:45 in the form of the narrative that recounted Israel's forced, lamentable return from the Promised Land to the deadly wilderness (cf. also Deut 2:1),[47] is reformulated in Genesis with the use of the commonly understandable image of the lamentable decomposition of the human body after the death (Gen 3:19). Accordingly, the universalistic idea of death as the consequence of human sin (Gen 3:19.24)[48] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the death in the wilderness was an inevitable consequence of the sin of the evil generation of the Israelites (Deut 1:35.37; 2:14-16). For this reason, the motif of dust in Gen 3:19 (cf. also 3:14) semantically corresponds to the motif of the wilderness in Deut 2:1 (cf. also Gen 2:7 and Deut 1:6). The somewhat strange image of wearing tunics made of skins (Gen 3:21),[49] something that reflects the severe climate of the desert rather than that of Israel, likewise seems to allude to the motif of the wilderness in Deut 2:1.

The concluding idea of a prohibition of entering the paradisiacal land (Gen 3:22-24) was borrowed from Deut 1:46-2:1. In Genesis, the Deuteronomic image of the sinful generation of the Israelites as forbidden from entering Canaan during their lifetime (Deut 1:35.37.46; 2:1.14-16)[50] was reworked, with the use of several well-known literary motifs, including that of the cherubim (cf. e.g. Ezek 41:18.20.25),[51] into the image of humans as forbidden from entering Eden (Gen 3:22-24). The somewhat strange use of the motif of a sword (Gen 3:24),[52]

---

47 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 27, 31.

48 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 72-73.

49 Cf. R. R. Reno, *Genesis*, 95.

50 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 29.

51 Cf. J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; 2nd edn., T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1930), 89-90; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 257-258; P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 440, 449-451, 453. In the perspective of Deuteronomy, the land of Canaan is regarded as a great, open sanctuary of Yahweh (for this reason, the Israelites have to be purified and adequately prepared before entering it, in order not to defile it: cf. Deut 5-33). The same idea applies to Paradise in Genesis. For this reason, the motif of the cherubim, which was traditionally related to walls, doors, and especially entrances to Middle Eastern temples (cf. Ezek 41:17-20.25 etc.), is used in Gen 3:24 in the function of guarding the main (i.e. eastern: cf. Ezek 10:19 etc.; cf. also Gen 4:16) entrance to the 'sanctuary' of Paradise.

52 Cf. P. J. Titus, *Second Story*, 444-446.

which was originally unrelated to that of the cherubim, most probably alludes to the image of the militant Amorites in Deut 1:44.

Accordingly, in Gen 3 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic account of Israel's 'original sin', with its particular, religious-national Israelite ideas (Deut 1:26-2:1), into a universalistic account of the original sin of all humankind.

2.3 The weaker brother and mighty predecessors (Gen 4; cf. Deut 2:2-12)

The motifs of (*a*) the sin of killing one's younger, shepherding brother; (*b*) travel to the east of the paradisiacal land; and (*c*) mighty forefathers (Gen 4) structurally correspond to the motifs of (*a'*) the order to maintain peaceful relationships with Israel's weaker, semi-nomadic brothers; (*b'*) travel to the land of Moab; and (*c'*) great predecessors (Deut 2:2-12).

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 4 and Deut 2:2-12 is provided by several common key words of both accounts: אח ([weaker] 'brother': Gen 4:2.8-11; Deut 2:4.8), שמר ('be attentive' [as concerns the weaker brother]: Gen 4:9; Deut 2:4), ארץ ('earth/land' [of wandering]: Gen 4:12.14; Deut 2:5.9), and תחת ('in place of' [other people]: Gen 4:25; Deut 2:12). It is worth noting that they occur in the same relative sequence in both accounts.

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 4 and Deut 2:2-12 is quite evident. The account of Israel's travel through the territory of his weaker brother Esau (Deut 2:2-7) constitutes an integral part of the narrative of Deuteronomy, a fact which makes the reverse direction of borrowing (from Genesis to Deuteronomy) highly implausible. Moreover, the name of Seth, who is regarded as replacing the mighty forefathers (Gen 4:25-26), may function as an allusion to Moab, regarded as replacing the earlier great inhabitants of its land (Deut 2:8-11; cf. Num 24:17), but not vice versa.

The story about Cain's sin of killing his younger, shepherding brother Abel; Cain's going to the east of Eden; and humankind's mighty forefathers (Gen 4) is therefore a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic account of Israel being ordered to travel peacefully through the territory of his weaker, semi-nomadic brother Esau; Israel's going to the land of Moab; and mighty predecessors of the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Israelites (Deut 2:2-12).

In particular, the story about Cain killing his younger brother Abel (Gen 4:1-12) illustrates the main ideas of the Deuteronomic account of Israel's travel through the territory of his weaker brother Esau (Deut 2:2-7). The narrative character of Cain (Gen 4:1), who is associated in Genesis with building a city (Gen 4:17) and with treating bronze and iron (Gen 4:22), and who consequently symbolizes urban, technically advanced civilization, alludes to the people of Israel, which is called to inherit the Promised Land with its cities (Deut 1:22.28 etc.) and with its natural resources, including iron and copper (Deut 8:9).[53] On the other hand, Cain's younger brother Abel (הבל), whose name means (mere) breath and vanity, and whose technical advancement as a semi-nomadic shepherd is evidently smaller than that of the settled farmer Cain (Gen 4:2), alludes to the people of the Edomites, who are presented in Deuteronomy as living in the semi-desert region of Seir (Deut 2:4; cf. 1:2; 2:1 etc.) and being afraid of their stronger brothers Israelites (Deut 2:3).

In Genesis, the Deuteronomic motif of Israel's relationship with his weaker brother Esau (Deut 2:2-7) was reworked into something more than a commonly understandable story about sibling rivalry. Since the story about the two brothers (Gen 4:1-12) is located in Genesis between the account of the creation and humanization of the man (Gen 2:4-25) and the account of the flood (Gen 6:5-8:19), both of which are literarily related to the initial and concluding fragments of the *Gilgamesh Epic*, it is reasonable to infer that the biblical story about the two brothers (Gen 4:1-12) reflects the well-known Mesopotamian story about the two fraternized ancient heroes Gilgamesh and Enkidu, one of whom suddenly died and was taken to the netherworld (*Gilgamesh Epic* I 209 – VII 267; cf. Gen 4:8.10-11).

The strange in itself image of Cain's offering as not respected by God (Gen 4:5)[54] illustrates the religious status of Israel in the exile (cf. Deut 2:1-7), in which sacrificing animals for Yahweh is not possible.[55] Moreover, Cain symbol-

---

53 It is worth noting that Cain is quite surprisingly presented in Gen 4:1 as not only humans' but also Yahweh's son (diff. Gen 4:25), something that illustrates the special status of Israel in its relationship with Yahweh (cf. e.g. Hos 2:1; 11:1; Deut 1:31).

54 Cf. K. Heyden, 'Die Sünde Kains: Exegetische Beobachtungen zu Gen 4,1-16', *BN* 118 (2003) 85-109 (esp. 88-90); R. R. Reno, *Genesis*, 99.

55 It should be noted that the technical term זבח is evidently avoided in Gen 4:3-5 because according to Deuteronomy sacrificing animals for Yahweh is permitted only in Canaan (cf. Deut 12:6 etc.; Gen 31:54; 46:1). A similar problem, also *c.*400 BC, concerned the temple at Elephantine; cf D. Edelman, 'Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusa-

izes the Israelites and all humankind in the aftermath of God's wrath against them (cf. Deut 1:34-2:1; Gen 3:16-24). However, although the visible signs of success suggest that it is Abel and not Cain who pleases Yahweh (Gen 4:3-5), Cain is called to cherish hope (Gen 4:6-7; cf. Deut 2:2-3.7) and maintain a relationship with Yahweh by means of being good (Gen 4:7), overcoming temptations (Gen 4:7), and holding a spiritual dialogue with Yahweh (Gen 4:6-7.9-15).

The somewhat strange presentation of Cain's sin as related to desire (תשוקה: Gen 4:7)[56] in fact alludes to Israel's desire for Esau's property, especially for his food and drink (Deut 2:5-6), hence the use of the word related to being thirsty (שקק: cf. Is 29:8; Ps 107:9) in Gen 4:7. Accordingly, the Deuteronomic idea of God-given command that Israel should not appropriate anything that belongs to its neighbour (Deut 2:4-7) is presented in Genesis in easily understandable terms of an exhortation to master human passions (Gen 4:7).

The somewhat surprising image of the homicide Cain (Gen 4:8) as narratively illustrating the apparently peaceful behaviour of Israel in the land of Edom (Deut 2:4-8; cf. also 2:9) originates from the Deuteronomic thought that the sinful generation of the Israelites could be termed 'men of (unholy) war' (Deut 2:14.16; cf. 1:41-44).

Cain's rhetorical question concerning his not being his brother's keeper (Gen 4:9) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that Israel was called to be attentive as concerned its weaker brother Esau (Deut 2:4). This idea is illustrated in Genesis with the use of the commonly understandable image of an older brother's denial of his natural responsibility for his younger sibling.

The interrelated ideas of (*a*) Cain's futile efforts to cultivate the soil and (*b*) his being a wanderer on the earth (Gen 4:12.14) allude to the Deuteronomic account of Israel's circuitous travel through the wilderness of Moab (Deut 2:8-9).[57] In Genesis, this Deuteronomic image was reworked into the well-known image of hard life of a banished, homeless exile. In the account of Genesis, the exiled but repenting Cain, who symbolizes the exiled but repenting Israel, is still pro-

---

lem Temple', in F. Stavrakopoulou and J. Barton (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 82-103 (esp. 83-84).

56 Cf. A. Wénin, 'Caïn: Un récit mythique pour explorer la violence', in V. Collado Bertomeu (ed.), *Palabra, prodigio, poesía*, Festschrift L. Alonso Schökel (AnBib 151; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2003), 37-53 (esp. 46).

57 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 276.

tected by Yahweh from death (Gen 4:15; cf. Ezek 9:4.6).[58] The surprising reference to the land of Nod ('homelessness'),[59] which was located east of Eden (Gen 4:16), additionally alludes to the land of Moab, which is located east of Canaan (cf. Deut 2:8-11).

The story about the descendants of Cain (Gen 4:17-24) alludes to the account of the earlier, mighty inhabitants of the lands of Moab, Edom, and Israel (Deut 2:10-12). With the use of well-known Mesopotamian motifs, especially that of seven antediluvian sages,[60] the story of Genesis presents the descendants of Cain as being ever more civilized on the one hand but ever more morally corrupt on the other (esp. Gen 4:23-24).[61] In this way, the posterity of Cain illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the contrast between the former (evil) and the present (chosen by God) inhabitants of Moab, Edom, and Israel.

On the other hand, the somewhat surprisingly introduced image of a new, good, more humane line of humankind's forefathers (Gen 4:25-26)[62] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Israelites as replacing earlier, evil inhabitants of their lands (Deut 2:9-12). In particular, the name of Seth (Gen 4:25-26) alludes to the Moabites (Deut 2:9-11; cf. Num 24:17),[63] and the name of Enosh ('human being'), who is presented as initiating

---

58 Cf. ibid. 278; E. Pfoh, 'Genesis 4 Revisited: Some Remarks on Divine Patronage', *SJOT* 23 (2009) 38-45 (esp. 42). Cf. also the use of the motif of Israel and Judah's great guilt (עון + גדול: Ezek 9:9) in Gen 4:13.

59 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, vol. 1, *Gen 1,1 – 11,26* (FzB 70; Echter: Würzburg 1992), 211; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 278-279; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 72-73.

60 Cf. R. R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (YNER 7; Yale University: New Haven · London 1977), 154; G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 110; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 283.

61 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 117; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 285-290. For this reason, the name Enoch ('dedicated') is used in Gen 4:17-18 at the beginning of the genealogy Gen 4:17-22, in difference to the later use of this name in Gen 5:18-24 (cf. 5:1-32).

62 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 1, 237.

63 Cf. L. Schmidt, *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri 10,11-36,13* (ATD 7/2; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004), 143; J. Day, 'Cain and the Kenites', in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (VTSup 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 335-346 (esp. 339-340).

the worship of Yahweh on the earth (Gen 4:26),[64] alludes to the people of Israel (Deut 2:12).[65]

In this way, with the use of the easily understandable image of humankind living in its prehistory a period of uncouth life, before its entering a more civilized era, in Gen 4 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic idea that on its way to Canaan Israel learned the hard but divinely protected life of semi-nomads in the wilderness (Deut 2:2-12).

2.4 New, righteous humanity taking the place of the completely destroyed, sinful humans (Gen 5:1-8:19; cf. Deut 2:13-3:11)

The account of the rise of innocent humanity and of complete destruction of sinful humans (Gen 5:1-8:19) structurally corresponds to the account of the rise of an innocent generation and of complete destruction of sinful nations (Deut 2:13-3:11).

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 5:1-8:19 and Deut 2:13-3:11 is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: שׁנה ([a number of] 'years' [of a generation of mighty men]: Gen 5:3-32; 6:3; 7:6.11; 8:13; Deut 2:14), מות ([mighty people] 'die': Gen 5:5-31; Deut 2:16), חלל ('begin' [the conflict]: Gen 6:1; Deut 2:24-25.31), ארץ ('earth/land' [of violence and destruction]: Gen 6:4-6.11-13.17; 7:4.21.23; Deut 2:24.27.31; 3:2), ימים ('days' [of life of the sinful generation]: Gen 6:4; cf. 7:4.10; 8:10.12; Deut 2:14), דור ([sinful] 'generation': Gen 6:9; 7:1; Deut 2:14), אמה ('cubit' [as a measure of length and width]: Gen 6:15; cf. 6:16; 7:20; Deut 3:11), בהמה ('animals' [surviving]: Gen 6:20; 7:2.8.14; 8:1; Deut 2:35; 3:7), רבה מאד ('be very great/numerous' [in the open country]: Gen 7:18; Deut 3:5), גבה ('high' [obstacles]: Gen 7:19; Deut 3:5), תחת כל־השׁמים ([people living] 'under the whole heaven': Gen 7:19; cf.

---

64 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 292.

65 It should be noted that although Enosh is the son of Seth, he is surprisingly introduced in Gen 4:26 as somehow parallel (גם־הוא: cf. Gen 4:4.22; 10:21; 19:38; 22:20.24; 27:31; 38:11; 48:19) to Seth (Gen 4:25): cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 290. For similar allusive reasons, the author of Genesis, using a rare passive syntactical construction (cf. also Gen 10:21 referring to Yahweh's chosen line of the Hebrews), avoids mentioning the name of Enosh's mother and also, to some extent, of Enosh's father (Gen 4:26; diff. Gen 4:17-18.20-22.25).

6:17; Deut 2:25; cf. also 4:19), שׁאר ('leave remaining' [survivors]: Gen 7:23; Deut 2:34; 3:3; cf. also 3:11), הר ('mountain' [in the north]: Gen 8:4; cf. 7:19-20; 8:5; Deut 3:8), and שׁלח ('send' [messengers of peace]: Gen 8:7-8.10.12; Deut 2:26).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 5:1-8:19 and Deut 2:13-3:11 is quite easy to ascertain. The description of innocent generations as replacing the sinful, powerful ones (Gen 5:1-32) is rather artificial in the narrative logic of Genesis. Consequently, it may be regarded as originating from Deut 2:14-16, and not vice versa. Likewise, the account of complete destruction of two sinful nations (Deut 2:24-3:11) constitutes an integral part of the narrative of Deuteronomy, whereas the account of complete destruction of sinful humans (Gen 6:1-8:19) could have been omitted from Genesis without far-reaching narrative consequences. This fact implies that Gen 5:1-8:19 is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 2:24-3:11 with the use of well-known Mesopotamian literary motifs.

Consequently, the account of the rise of innocent humanity and of complete destruction of sinful humans (Gen 5:1-8:19) may be regarded as a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic account of the rise of an innocent generation and of complete destruction of sinful nations (Deut 2:13-3:11).

In particular, the long list of the descendants of Adam (Gen 5:1-32), which is evidently related to the preceding list Gen 4:17-24, apparently contradicts it in numerous details (cf. Cain in Gen 4:1-17 and Cainan in Gen 5:9-14, Mehujael in Gen 4:18 and Mahalalel in Gen 5:12-17, Irad in Gen 4:18 and Jared in Gen 5:15-20, Enoch as Cain's son in Gen 4:17-18 and as Jared's son in Gen 5:18-24, Methushael in Gen 4:18 and Methuselah in Gen 5:21-27, the wicked Lamech's progeny in Gen 4:20-22 and the righteous Lamech's progeny in Gen 5:28-29). However, it develops the optimistic theme of the conclusive fragment Gen 4:25-26.[66] The new list (Gen 5:1-32) does not originate from a source which would be different from that of Gen 4:17-24, but it narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the wicked generation of the Israelites was replaced with a new, innocent one (Deut 2:14-16). The new genealogy, evidently related to the preceding one, symbolizes a new start of humankind, after its first, failed beginning,[67] resembling that of Israel in the wilderness. Just as the savage depravity of Lamech, who concludes the first genealogy of humankind (Gen 4:23-24),

---

66 See K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 279-282, 296-297; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 84-85; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 79, 82-83.

67 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 251; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 79-81.

alludes to the ‘confounded’ and ‘finished’, prematurely dying generation of the ‘men of war’ (Deut 2:14-16; diff. 31:2; 34:7),[68] the exemplary behaviour and longevity of the new-version patriarchs (Gen 5:1-32; esp. the seventh one: Gen 5:24 diff. 4:23-24) allude to the new, innocent generation of the Israelites, which replaced the wicked one (Deut 2:16).

The particular contents of the list Gen 5:1-32, which presents half-legendary, fertile, and longeval predecessors of humankind, probably allude, maybe with the use of Mesopotamian literary motifs of king lists etc.,[69] to the Deuteronomic text Deut 2:20-23. However, the surprising numbers in the list Gen 5:1-32 are calculated in such a way that they illustrate the ideas of Deut 2:14-16. According to Gen 5:3 the righteous Seth was born when his father was 130 years old, at which time his elder, wicked brother Cain must already have died,[70] and consequently a generational break must have separated the old and the new humankind. On the other hand, the great overlap between the generations of the new humankind (Gen 5:4-6 etc.) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that numerous subsequent generations of faithful Israelites should maintain spiritual continuity with their ancestors (Deut 4:9; 6:2 etc.).

The subsequent account of complete destruction of sinful humans (Gen 6:1-8:19) is a reworking of the subsequent Deuteronomic account of complete destruction of sinful nations (Deut 2:24-3:11). The author of Genesis espoused the Deuteronomic idea that the divinely ordered destruction affected only sinful humans, even if their number amounted to a whole generation or a whole nation (Deut 2:14-16.30.32-34; 3:1-3.6). For this reason, he provided some universalistic rationale for the universal flood which affected almost all humans and animals on the earth (Gen 6:5-7.9.12-13; 7:1).

The half-legendary story about the apparently illicit marital relationships of the sons of God with the daughters of humans (Gen 6:1-4), which introduces the account of the flood, provides the first rationale for the destruction of the alleg-

---

68 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 40-41.

69 See K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 297 n. 4; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 86; J. Day, ‘Cain’, 341.

70 The reader may count 50 years as the maximal age at which Eve could still be fertile and 80 years as the maximal natural lifetime of her son Cain (cf. e.g. Ps 90:10), thus obtaining 130 years as Adam’s age at which Cain must certainly have been dead. For a similar calculation, which points to the righteous Metuselach and Lamech’s natural death before the punishing flood, see Gen 5:27.30-31 (cf. also 5:19-20 SP) with Gen 7:6.

edly utterly depraved humankind (cf. also Gen 6:5-6),[71] an explanation which is quite surprising in the context of the preceding optimistic fragment Gen 5:1-32. The thought that marriages of the 'sons of God' (i.e., allusively, the Israelites: cf. Deut 1:31; 8:5) with 'ordinary' people are generally forbidden (Gen 6:1-2) originates from Deut 7:3.[72] The narratively related, surprising thought that the human lifetime was limited by God to 120 years (Gen 6:3; diff. e.g. Ps 90:10)[73] is a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic motif of Moses' exceptionally long, full life (Deut 31:2; 34:7),[74] a motif which was quite naturally used in its original literary context (cf. also Josh 24:29; Judg 2:8). The enigmatic motif of divine-human, powerful but fallen warriors ('Nephilim': Gen 6:4; cf. Ezek 32:27)[75] illustrates the story about Israel's Amorite neighbour Og, the powerful but fallen king of Bashan, who was regarded as the remnant of the Rephaim (Deut 3:1-5.11.13).

The particular description of all the earth as full of violence, wickedness, and corruption (Gen 6:4-6.11-13) in the days of life of the sinful generation (Gen 6:3-5; 7:4.10.12.17.24), and consequently of all life on the earth as deserving unavoidable, punishing destruction (Gen 6:17; 7:4.6.10-12.17-24), is a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic image of the land of Sihon king of Heshbon and Og king of Bashan as the place of unavoidable, punishing destruction of all sinful humans (Deut 2:24.27.31; 3:2). Another Deuteronomic idea which contributed to the composition of the account of the flood (Gen 6:5-8:19) was the idea of complete destruction of the sinful generation of the Israelites (Deut 1:35.37; 2:14-16), with the exception of the innocent Caleb son of Jephunneh, Joshua son of Nun, and the small children of the Israelites (Deut 1:36.38-39). The author of Genesis reworked these ideas with the use of the well-known Mesopotamian motif of a great flood (cf. e.g. *Eridu Genesis* 145-208 [C.11-

---

71 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 90.

72 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 330-331.

73 Within the narrative of Genesis, numerous exceptions to this rule may be found: Noah (Gen 9:29), the Semites (Gen 11:10-26.32), Abraham (Gen 25:7) with Sarah (Gen 23:1), Ishmael (Gen 25:17), Isaac (Gen 35:28-29), and Jacob (Gen 47:28). The exceptional lifetime of all these ancestors of Israel illustrates the thought that Israel was particularly chosen by God from all humankind (cf. also the similar thought that the Aaronites were particularly chosen from all the Israelites: Exod 6:16.18.20; Num 33:39).

74 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 335.

75 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Prologue*, 154-155.

D.8];[76] *Atrahasis Epic* II vii 44 – III v 30; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 14-156),[77] which had its natural setting in Mesopotamia's at times inundated lowlands and not in Israel's mountains.[78] In this way, the Deuteronomic idea of holy war which should be accompanied with a total, destructive ban on the inhabitants of the conquered land was presented in Genesis in widely understandable terms of a great natural disaster. Accordingly, the military, dangerous, and destructive concept of holy war was 'defused' in Genesis with the use of the politically harmless legend about a past flood.

The description of the ark as being not a ship but a great, elongated, tripartite chest, in which the longeval patriarch remained (Gen 6:14-16; cf. 7:23; diff. *Atrahasis Epic* III i 22-36; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 24-31, 58-63), alludes to the prophetic idea of the great, elongated, tripartite temple (Ezek 40:48-41:4)[79] in order to suggest that salvation of humanity can be found in Israel's temple of Yahweh. The related thought that all kinds of animals, apart from humans, were saved from the universal disaster by having been brought to Noah's ark (Gen 6:19-21; 7:2-3.8-9.14-16; 8:1.17.19; cf. *Atrahasis Epic* III ii 32-38)[80] reflects the Deuter-

---

76 The numbering of lines of the text of *Eridu Genesis* follows the edition of M. Civil, 'The Sumerian Flood Story', in W. G. Lambert, A. R. Millard, and M. Civil, *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood, with the Sumerian Flood Story* (Clarendon: Oxford 1969), 138-145 and in square brackets that of 'The Flood story (1.7.4)', in *The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford), updated 19 Dec. 2006 <http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed 21 Sept. 2011.

77 Cf. N. C. Baumgart, *Die Umkehr des Schöpfergottes: Zu Komposition und religionsgeschichtlichem Hintergrund von Gen 5-9* (HBS 22; Herder: Freiburg [et al.] 1999), 419-559; D. Dziadosz, *Tak było*, 218-223; H. S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading* (JSJSup 149; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011), 209-233, 313.

78 Cf. also the reworking of the traditional motif of the righteous Noah who saved only his life during a punishing disaster (Ezek 14:14.16.18.20; cf. Gen 6:9) into the image of Noah as foreshadowing Israel's remnant, who saved their children too (Gen 6:18; 7:1.7.13; 8:16.18; cf. Ezek 14:22). The surprising etymology of the name Noah in Gen 5:29 (נחם) seems to originate, likewise, from Ezek 14:22-23.

79 Cf. S. Holloway, 'What Ship Goes There: The Flood Narrative in the Gilgamesh Epic and Genesis Considered in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Temple Ideology', *ZAW* 103 (1991) 328-355 (esp. 348-349, 353).

80 It should be noted that the numbers given in Gen 6:19-20; 7:2-3.9.15 do not contradict one another, and consequently there is no need to postulate the use of various sources (J, P, etc.) in the account of the flood (Gen 6:5-8:19). The first utterance (Gen 6:19-20) is quite general; it refers to bringing pairs of all living creatures: humans (cf. Gen 6:18)

onomic thought that animals should be spared and taken along during the holy war (Deut 2:35; 3:7; cf. 20:14).

The surprising way of calculating the time of the flood, that is after 40 + 7 days of preparations (Gen 7:4.10-11; cf. *Atrahasis Epic* III i 37) 40 days of destructive rain (Gen 7:4.12.17; cf. 7:23; diff. *Eridu Genesis* 203 [D.3]; *Atrahasis Epic* III iv 24; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 128-131), which caused 150 (and more) days of swelling and receding of the waters (Gen 7:24; 8:3-5),[81] which was followed by 40 (and more) + 7 + 7 days of waiting for the destructive waters to be dried up (Gen 8:6.10.12), all of which amounted to a full year (Gen 7:6; 8:13),[82] most probably illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of almost 40 full years as the time of destroying the sinful Israelites in the wilderness (Deut 2:14; cf. 1:3; 2:7; 8:2.4; 29:4).

The description of the waters of the flood as 'greatly increasing' on the earth (Gen 7:18; cf. 7:17.19-20.24) is a result of a reworking of the Deuteronomic

---

and animals (שׁנים מכל). The second utterance (Gen 7:2-3), which develops the idea of the difference between the righteous Noah and other humans (Gen 7:1), differentiates between clean (שׁבעה שׁבעה: 7 + 7 taken) and unclean (שׁנים: 2 taken) kinds of animals; the clean animals were taken in a greater number not least because some of them should be offered on the altar after the flood (Gen 8:20). The third and fourth utterances (Gen 7:8-9.14-16) describe all the animals' particular way of entering the ark, a way which was similar to that of humans (cf. Gen 7:7.13.15-16), namely in male-female pairs (שׁנים שׁנים). Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 176-177; V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 287, 289.

81 It should be noted that the time indicators in Gen 7:11 (the 17th day of the 2nd month) and in Gen 8:4 (the 17th day of the 7th month, so 150 days later) imply that the references to 150 days in Gen 7:24 ('one hundred and fifty days') and in Gen 8:3 ('at the end of the hundred and fifty days') point to the same period of time, and not to two consecutive periods. The author of Genesis evidently described the same events from two different theological perspectives, those of destruction and salvation. Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 180, 183-184; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 356 n. 11, 377-378, 382; C. Dohmen, 'Untergang oder Rettung der Quellenscheidung? Die Sintfluterzählung als Prüfstein der Pentateuchexegese', in A. Wénin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (BETL 155; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven [et al.] 2001), 81-104 (esp. 96).

82 A closer look on all these numbers reveals that they are reconcilable with one another, and consequently there is no need to postulate the use of various sources (J, P, etc.) here. Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 169; J. E. Hartley, *Genesis* (NIBCOT 1; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2000), 100-101, 107; C. Dohmen, 'Untergang', 96.

description of the villages of the land as being very numerous (Deut 3:5). The description of the waters as covering all the high mountains (Gen 7:19; cf. 7:20; 8:4-5) originates from the Deuteronomic description of the towns of the land as protected with high walls (Deut 3:5). The motif of the northern mountainous region of Ararat (Gen 8:4; cf. Jer 51:27; diff. *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 142-146) alludes to the image of Mount Hermon regarded as the northern border of the conquered territory (Deut 3:8-9; 4:48). The author of Genesis evidently reworked the image of the Israelites as conquering all the highly walled and numerous towns in the region of Argob (Deut 3:4-6; cf. 3:10) with the use of the politically neutral, legendary, Mesopotamian image of floodwaters as prevailing over all numerous and high mountains on the earth (Gen 7:17-8:5).

The related image of the destructive waters as covering all the mountains under the whole heaven (Gen 7:19; cf. 6:17) in a pacific way illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as causing fear of destruction in all the nations under the whole heaven (Deut 2:25; cf. also 4:19; 7:24; 9:14; 25:19; 29:19). The likewise related, politically harmless image of the flood as not leaving any survivors except those in Noah's ark (Gen 7:23) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as not leaving any survivors in the kingdoms of Sihon and Og (Deut 2:34; 3:3).

The motif of sending out birds from the ark to see whether the land was ready for living there (Gen 8:7-12) was borrowed from the Mesopotamian literature (e.g. *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 147-156)[83] in order to present in a universalistic way the Deuteronomic image of the Israelites as sending messengers of peace to the land of Sihon (Deut 2:26-29). The particular reworking of the Mesopotamian motif of the birds in such a way that it was the dove that found a new land after the flood and that brought to Noah a leaf of the olive tree, the symbol of the land of Canaan (cf. Deut 6:11; cf. also Hos 14:7; Jer 11:16; Zech 4:3-14), thus announcing a new beginning of life on the earth (Gen 8:8-12; diff. *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 154-156), was probably influenced by the motif of a dove regarded as a metaphor of the Israelites returning from Assyria to the land of Canaan (Hos 11:11; cf. Is 60:8; Jon 1:1-2 etc.).[84] The concluding image of going out of the ark to the dry land (Gen 8:13-19) most probably illustrates the idea of the Israelites as taking the land after the destructive war beyond the Jordan (Deut 3:8.10).

---

83 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 105-107; H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš', 222.

84 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 186-187.

In this way, the author of Genesis used traditional Mesopotamian motifs to express and reformulate in a pacific way the militant, politically dangerous, Deuteronomic idea of the holy war which was conducted by the Israelites in the eastern region of Transjordan. Consequently, the Deuteronomic ideology of Israel's absolute obedience to Yahweh's directives (Deut 2:24.31 etc.) was reformulated into a more universalistic one (cf. Gen 6:22; 7:5.9.16) and presented in terms of human general righteousness, blamelessness, conducting one's life with God, living in a monogamic marriage, and preserving at least basic distinctions between cleanness and uncleanness (cf. Gen 6:9.19; 7:1-3.7-9).

2.5 Covenant with the ancestors, division of the earth, and the punishment of scattering for making an idolatrous object (Gen 8:20-11:32; cf. Deut 3:12-5:33)

The combination of the ideas of making a universal covenant, avenging blood, seeing no form (only fire in the midst of clouds) as the sign of the covenant, honouring one's father, dividing the land, living among many nations, inhabiting a city in the east, making an idolatrous object, Yahweh's being jealous, punishment of scattering, and the hope for a return to Canaan (Gen 8:20-11:32) structurally corresponds to a similar combination in Deut 3:12-5:33.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 8:20-11:32 and Deut 3:12-5:33 is provided by the sequence of words כל, רמשׂ, אדמה, כל, דג\דגה ('anything that creeps on the ground, any fish…'), which is distinctive of both texts in the Bible (Gen 9:2; Deut 4:18), and by numerous other common key words: ארץ ('earth/land' [given by God and divided]: Gen 9:1.7; 10:5 et al.; Deut 3:12.18.20.25.28 et al.), ברית ('covenant' [with ancestors]: Gen 9:9-17; Deut 4:13.23.31; 5:2-3), כרת ('make' [a covenant]: Gen 9:11; Deut 4:23; 5:2-3), ענן ('cloud' [marking the covenant]: Gen 9:13-14.16; Deut 4:11; 5:22), אהל ('tent' [as a place of dwelling after the covenant]: Gen 9:21.27; Deut 5:30), גוים ('nations' [of the earth]: Gen 10:5.20.31-32; Deut 4:27), גבול ('boundary' [in Canaan]: Gen 10:19; Deut 3:14.16-17), עיר ('city' [in the east]: Gen 11:4-5.8; Deut 4:41-42), עשׂה ('make' [an idolatrous object]: Gen 11:4.6; Deut 4:16.23.25; 5:8), and פוץ ('scatter' [as a punishment]: Gen 11:8-9; Deut 4:27).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 8:20-11:32 and Deut 3:12-5:33 is quite easy to ascertain. The idea of the rainbow as the sign of

the covenant (Gen 9:13-16) could have originated from the motif of fire in the midst of clouds (Deut 4:11; 5:22), but not vice versa. Likewise, the account of building the city and the tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9) could have originated from a conflation of the motifs of living among many nations, inhabiting a city in the east, making an idolatrous object, Yahweh's jealousy, and the punishment of scattering (Deut 4:3.6-8.15-28.33-34.43; 5:8-9), with the use of the well-known Mesopotamian motif of building a city and a tower in Babylon, but not vice versa.

The textual unit which deals with the issues of making a covenant with the ancestors, avenging blood, seeing no form (only fire in the midst of clouds) as the sign of the covenant, honouring one's father, dividing the land, living among many nations, inhabiting a city in the east, making an idolatrous object, Yahweh's jealousy, the punishment of scattering, and the hope for a return to Canaan (Gen 8:20-11:32) is therefore a result of a reworking of the structurally corresponding textual unit Deut 3:12-5:33. The motifs of Deut 3:12-5:33 were reworked in Gen 8:20-11:32 in a literarily complex and variegated way.

In particular, the opening motifs of the survivor offering a sacrifice after going out of the ark (Gen 8:20-22) and of God making a covenant with the survivor, a covenant which somehow referred to preserving the life of animals and humans (Gen 9:1-17), were borrowed from the Mesopotamian literature (cf. e.g. *Eridu Genesis* 209-260 [D.9-E.12]; *Atrahasis Epic* III v 31-35; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 157-206).[85] However, in Genesis they illustrate the particular themes of Deut 3:12-5:33.

The strange in itself image of God as promising the lasting of life on the earth notwithstanding humans being still evil (Gen 8:21-22)[86] probably illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that some Israelites had been given arable land (and consequently their life chance) in the religiously ambiguous Transjordan before they were fully instructed at the River Jordan in obeying Yahweh's will (Deut 3:12-29). The idea of being again given the chance to live and multiply on the earth (Gen 9:1-3.7) illustrates a similar idea in Deut 3:12-20 (cf. also 3:21-22.27-28). The surprisingly introduced motif of fish (as supplementing the reference to animals, birds, and everything that creeps on the ground: Gen 9:2; diff. 8:19) was borrowed from Deut 4:17-18. In this way, the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic prohibition of making and serving cultic images of liv-

85 Cf. H. U. Steymans, 'Gilgameš', 224-225.

86 Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, *The Theology of the Book of Genesis* (OTT; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2009), 111-114.

ing creatures (Deut 4:17-19) with the use of the widely understandable picture of all fauna and flora presented as subdued to the will of humans who live on the earth (Gen 9:2-3; cf. Deut 4:19; cf. also Gen 1:28-29).

The idea of avenging human blood, a rule which was regarded as one of the most important stipulations of the covenant (Gen 9:5-6), illustrates the idea of not avenging unintentional homicides (Deut 4:42; 5:17; cf. also 19:10-13)[87] with the use of the somehow understandable idea of a basic dietary taboo which concerns eating flesh with its blood (Gen 9:4; cf. Ezek 33:25; Deut 12:16.23; 15:23) as well as the well-known juridical idea of *lex talionis* (cf. e.g. the Code of Hammurabi §§ 1-3, 116, 153, 210, 229-230).[88]

The idea of God as making a universal, fundamental covenant with humanity's ancestors and their descendants, and with all animals, after the flood (Gen 9:8-17), an idea which may be traced back to the Mesopotamian literature (cf. e.g. *Eridu Genesis* 251-260 [E.1-12]; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 199-206), functions in Genesis as a reworking of the idea of Yahweh as making a fundamental covenant with Israel's ancestors and their descendants at Horeb (Deut 4:10.13-14.23.25-31; 5:2-22). The stipulations of the Noachian covenant, which are quite general but universally binding in their moral aspect (Gen 9:4-6), reflect the general but universally binding moral precepts of the Decalogue (Deut 5:6-21; esp. 5:17). The idea of God as remembering and establishing an everlasting covenant (וזכרתי, הקמתי, ברית עולם: Gen 9:15-17) originates from Ezek 16:60.

The somewhat surprising image of the rainbow in the clouds as the sign of the Noachian covenant (Gen 9:12-17) may originate from the thematically related Mesopotamian motif of a divine necklace made of gems (cf. e.g. *Atrahasis Epic* III vi 2-4; *Gilgamesh Epic* XI 165-167) or from a simple human observation of a rainbow after a heavy rain. However, it certainly illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of seeing no form (only fire in the midst of clouds) as the sign of the covenant at Horeb (Deut 4:11-12.15; 5:22). The author of Genesis illustrated the particularly Israelite idea of hearing the voice of God but not seeing any image of God at the volcano-like mountain of Horeb, which was burning with fire in the midst of clouds (Deut 4:11; 5:22; cf. Ezek 1:4.27-28),[89] by referring to the common human experience of observing the vague, non-material apparition of the rainbow in the clouds in the beams of light (or 'fire') after a heavy rain (cf. Ezek 1:28 comparing the glory of Yahweh to a rainbow).

---

87 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 124-125.

88 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 109-110.

89 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 275; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 66.

The surprisingly introduced story about Noah's drunkenness and about differing attitudes of Noah's sons to their father (Gen 9:18-27)[90] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that one of the fundamental precepts of the covenant with the ancestors referred to honouring one's father and one's mother (Deut 5:16).[91] The author of Genesis reworked this idea with the use of the widely understandable image of seeing or covering one's father's nakedness (cf. Ezek 22:10; cf. also Is 47:3; Ezek 16:8.37). The particular motif of the transgression of Ham, who was the ancestor of the Egyptians and the Canaanites (Gen 9:22; 10:6.15-18), illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of the Egyptians and the Canaanites as Israel's main historical enemies (Deut 4:20.34.37-38; 5:6.15; cf. also 7:1).[92] The setting of the story, namely a tent, which is somewhat strangely presented as a place of humanity's permanent dwelling after the universal covenant (Gen 9:21-27; diff. 4:17), reflects the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites lived in tents after the covenant at Horeb (Deut 5:30; cf. also 1:27; 11:6 etc.).

The genealogical list of seventy descendants of Noah's sons, which has the features of rhetorical enumeration of the nations of the world (cf. e.g. Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.90-97; cf. also 7.61-95)[93] and of geographical description of the earth as given by God and divided among the nations, in particular by setting boundaries of the Canaanites (Gen 10:1-32; esp. 10:5.19),[94] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of dividing the God-given land in Transjordan among the tribes of Israel (Deut 3:12-17; cf. also 3:18-20.25.27-28; 4:21-22.26.47-49 etc.), regarded as chosen from among all nations (cf. Deut 4:6-8.27.33-34.38), with the use of the likewise Deuteronomic idea that the number of the nations which were separated (פרד) on the earth corresponds to that of the sons of Israel (Deut 32:8; cf. 10:22;

---

90 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 181-182.

91 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 105-106.

92 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 421.

93 In fact, the contents of the Table of Nations in Gen 10 seem to reflect the diversity of nations within the borders of the Persian Empire in the fifth century BC (from Ionia in the west and Ethiopia in the south to India in the east). Cf. E. A. Knauf, 'Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (BETL 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 101-118 (esp. 107). *Pace* K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 439 n. 41 Persia could have been omitted in Gen 10:1-32 for political reasons, in order not to equate it with its vassals.

94 Cf. J.-L. Ska, 'Le genealogie della Genesi e le risposte alle sfide della storia', *RStB* 17 (2005) no. 1, 89-111 (esp. 103); B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 117.

cf. also Gen 46:27: seventy).[95] The surprising presentation of Israel's historical enemies (Egypt: Gen 10:6.13, Babylonia and Assyria: Gen 10:8-12, the Philistines: Gen 10:14, and the Canaanites: Gen 10:15-19) as related to the cursed Ham[96] reflects one of the ideas of Deut 3:12-5:33, namely that of Egypt as Israel's main historical enemy (Deut 4:20.34; 5:6.15). In this way, the author of Genesis presented the particularly Israelite idea of being chosen from among many nations, as well as that of being given the land in Canaan with its well-defined boundaries, with the use of the traditional motif of the list of the nations of the world, in which, in the version of Genesis, Canaan with its well-defined boundaries occupies the central place.[97]

The account of building the city and the tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9; cf. also 10:8-12) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas of Israel's living among many nations (Deut 4:6-8.19.27.33-34), inhabiting particular cities in the east (Deut 4:41-43), making an idolatrous object (Deut 4:15-19.23.25.28; 5:8-9), Yahweh's jealousy (Deut 4:3.20.24; 5:9), and the punishment of scattering (Deut 4:27)[98] with the use of the well-known Mesopotamian motif of building a city and a temple-tower in Babylon (e.g. *Enuma Elish* VI 57-66; Schøyen MS 2063).[99] By

---

95 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 437, 442-443.

96 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 110. *Pace* R. E. Gmirkin, *Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentatuech* (LHBOTS 433; T&T Clark: New York · London 2006), 163 the fragment Gen 10:8-12 implies that the sons of Ham do not correspond with the Ptolemaic realm; moreover, the absence of Persia among Israel's historical enemies (Gen 10:8-20) implies that Gen 10 was not written after the fall of the Persian Empire.

97 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 433.

98 For this reason, the Tower of Babel episode (Gen 11:1-9; cf. Deut 4:3-5:9) somewhat surprisingly follows and not precedes the Table of Nations (Gen 10; cf. Deut 3:12-17).

99 It should be noted that the paradigmatic character of the divine punishment which was inflicted on Babylon (Gen 11:5-9) and not, for example, on Nineveh (cf. e.g. Nah 1:1; Zeph 2:13; cf. also Gen 10:11-12) suggests that Genesis was written after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, in the Persian period. In particular, the demise of Babylon's famous ziggurat, which was restored from ruins by Nabopolassar (626-605 BC) and Nebuchadnezzar II (604-562 BC) and demolished soon afterwards by Cyrus (538 BC), Darius I (519 BC), and Xerxes (*c*.483 BC), a fact which is evidently alluded to in Gen 11:2-9, constitutes the *terminus a quo* of the Genesis story. Accordingly, the surprising statement that the whole earth had one common language (Gen 11:1.6-7; diff. 10:5.20.31) most probably reflects the first, Persian (and linguistically Aramaic) 'globalization' of the world which was known to the Israelites. These facts have not been taken into due consideration by R. E. Gmirkin, *Berossus*, 119-133.

means of an easily understandable but theologically naive story, which depicts Yahweh as being jealous of humanity's technical achievements,[100] the author of Genesis presented the theologically profound, covenant-related ideas of Yahweh as being jealous of the Israelites' love and of the Israelites as being punished with scattering among many nations for their idolatry.[101]

The genealogical list and the account of the travel from the Chaldeans to the land of Canaan (Gen 11:10-32)[102] narratively illustrate the main idea of Deut 4:28-31 (cf. also Deut 4:37; Is 48:20), namely that of the hope for a return of the descendants of Israel's ancestors from the land of idolatry to their homeland. Besides, the surprising account of the travel of Abram's father (אב) Terah not to Canaan but to the Aramaean city of Haran (cf. Gen 27:43; 28:2) and of his dwelling there (Gen 11:31-32)[103] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites' ancestor was a wandering Aramaean (Deut 26:5).

Accordingly, the conclusion of the narrative about humanity's prehistory (Gen 8:20-11:32) illustrates the ideas of the Deuteronomic text which refers to Israel's prehistory: the covenant with the ancestors at Horeb, the division of the land outside Canaan in Transjordan, and the preparations for entering the Promised Land (Deut 3:12-5:33). The author of Genesis explained these covenant-related ideas with the use of the widely understandable literary motifs of a conciliatory covenant after a punishing disaster, rainbow as a sign of the end of a storm, enumeration of the nations of the world, building a city and a tower in Babylon, etc. In this way, Israel's Deuteronomic ideas could be presented as much more universalistic in their scope.

2.6 Yahweh leading the believer to the Promised Land (Gen 12:1-8; cf. Deut 6:1-19)

The ideas of travel and entry to the land which was promised by Yahweh to Abram, as well as that of strict and obedient monolatry (Gen 12:1-8), structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 6:1-19.

---

100 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 119 n. 285.

101 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 66-69, 80-81.

102 Cf. C. M. Kaminski, *From Noah to Israel: Realization of the Primaeval Blessing after the Flood* (JSOTSup 413; T&T Clark: London · New York 2004), 68-79, 92-93.

103 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, vol. 2, *Gen 11,27 – 25,18* (FzB 98; Echter: Würzburg 2002), 94.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 12:1-8 and Deut 6:1-19 is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: ארץ ([promised] 'land': Gen 12:1.5-7; Deut 6:1.3.10.18), כאשר דבר יהוה ('as Yahweh has spoken' [about the Promised Land]: Gen 12:4; Deut 6:3.19), בוא ('come' [to the Promised Land]: Gen 12:5; Deut 6:10.18), עבר ('pass' [to the Promised Land]: Gen 12:6; Deut 6:1), and שׁם ([worship in Yahweh's] name: Gen 12:8; Deut 6:13).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 12:1-8 and Deut 6:1-19 may be ascertained on the basis of the simple, natural use of the name Abraham as referring to one of Israel's forefathers in Deut 6:10 on the one hand and the complicated narrative device of changing the name Abram to Abraham in Gen 17:15 on the other, a fact which implies posteriority of Gen 12:1-8 against Deut 6:1-19.

Accordingly, the account of Abram being led by Yahweh to the Promised Land (Gen 12:1-8) is thematically based on the Deuteronomic promise that the Israelites will be brought to the land which Yahweh God swore to their forefathers: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Deut 6:10). Since the motif of the promise concerning Abraham and the future of Israel occurs in Deuteronomy for the first time in Deut 6:10,[104] its reworked version concerning Abram/Abraham and Israel also occurs in Genesis not earlier than in the section which sequentially corresponds to Deut 6:1-19, namely Gen 12:1-8.[105]

The particular command to leave the land of idolatry and go to the land of strict and obedient faith in Yahweh (Gen 12:1.4-5.7-8) in a narrative, easily understandable way illustrates the Deuteronomic command to practise strictly monolatrous, obedient faith (Deut 6:1-19; esp. 6:4-5.13-14). The related image of Abram as leaving his home (בית) and travelling (הלך) in faith with his brother's son (בן: Gen 12:1.4-5) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that a faithful Israelite should keep and profess his faith both at home and during his travel with his sons (Deut 6:7).

The particular, semantically unclear phrase לך־לך, used at the beginning of the story about Abram/Abraham (Gen 12:1), most probably echoes the expression פנו וסעו לכם at the beginning of the Deuteronomic story about Moses and Israel (Deut 1:7). Likewise, the strange in itself promise that Yahweh will at

104 In Deut 1:8 the similar motif of the land which was sworn to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is used in the context of a command which refers to Israel's present, and not to its future.

105 In difference to Gen 12:1-3 the preceding text Gen 11:31 does not contain the motif of the promise concerning Abraham and Israel.

some time show Abram the land to which he shall go (ראה + ארץ: Gen 12:1)[106] originates from the Deuteronomic motif of Yahweh eventually showing Moses the land of Canaan (Deut 1:8.21; 3:25-28; 34:1.4).[107] Accordingly, the whole story about the old Abram/Abraham, the ancestor of the Israelites (Gen 12:1-25:10), should be interpreted as a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic story about the old Moses, the spiritual father of Israel.[108]

Consequently, it may be reasonably inferred that the author of Genesis used the Deuteronomic story about Moses and the Israelites on two, or even three, hypertextual levels. The first of them is the 'universal' level of sequential hypertextual reworking of the whole book of Deuteronomy in the whole book of Genesis. The second, 'successional' one is the level of hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic story in the story about the succession of the patriarchs: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph (Gen 12-50).[109] The third, 'biographic' one is the level of hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic story in a story about one narrative character, for example Abraham (Gen 12:1-25:10).[110]

The motif of the promise that Abram's posterity will be a great nation (Gen 12:2) originates from the similar motif of the promise that Israel will be a very numerous people (Deut 6:3). This Deuteronomic idea was adopted in Gen 12:3 in the universalistic context of Yahweh's indirect blessing for all the families of the earth.

The Deuteronomic motif of acting 'as Yahweh has spoken' (Gen 12:4; cf. Deut 1:21; 2:1; 6:3.19 et al.; cf. also Gen 24:51) is used in Genesis somewhat

---

106 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 2, 110.

107 Cf. A. Flury-Schölch, *Abrahams Segen und die Völker: Synchrone und diachrone Untersuchungen zu Gen 12,1-3 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der intertextuellen Beziehungen zu Gen 18; 22; 26; 28; Sir 44; Jer 4 und Ps 72* (FzB 115; Echter: Würzburg 2007), 294-298, 328.

108 For this reason, the strange in itself image of Abram as being childless and nevertheless leaving his brother, his relatives, and his father's house in order to observe Yahweh's word (Gen 11:30-12:1; diff. 11:28) alludes to the Deuteronomic features of the priestly character of Moses (cf. Deut 33:9).

109 On this second, 'successional' level, Abraham represents Moses; Lot and Ishmael stand for the older, sinful generation of the Israelites, who despised the land of Canaan and did not inherit it; Isaac symbolizes the younger, innocent generation which was born in the wilderness; etc.

110 On this third, 'biographic' level, the story about the life of just one character (e.g. Abraham) illustrates the whole story narrated in Deuteronomy: from the initial entry to Canaan to the death and burial of Moses.

redundantly and in a somewhat different meaning, illustrating the believer's complete obedience to Yahweh. Accordingly, the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic, covenantal-nomistic idea of religion regarded as observance of Yahweh's commandment, statutes and ordinances (Deut 6:1 etc.)[111] into the more universalistic concept of simple but faithful obedience to Yahweh's will (Gen 12:1-4).

The description of Abram's travel from Mesopotamia to the land of Canaan, which was shown and promised to him (Gen 12:5), in an easily understandable way illustrates the Deuteronomic promise that the Israelites will finally come from Mesopotamia to their homeland in Canaan (Deut 6:10.18). Accordingly, the author of Genesis reworked the idea which could be understood in a militant way into a wholly pacific one, namely that of travel from one land to another.

The similar Deuteronomic motif of the believers 'passing' to Canaan (Deut 6:1) was used and reformulated in Gen 12:6-7 in order to illustrate the Israelite, postexilic thought that since the region of Shechem is located in the very heart of the land of Canaan (cf. e.g. Josh 20:7),[112] precisely this region should be regarded as the central place (מקום: cf. e.g. Deut 12:5-26)[113] of Israel's worship of Yahweh (cf. Deut 11:29-12:28; Josh 24:1-27; cf. also Gen 22:1-19).[114] Likewise, the remark concerning Abram's worship in Yahweh's name (Gen 12:8) illustrates the main idea of Deut 6:13. The additional motif of the oak of Moreh as growing near Shechem (Gen 12:6) originates from Deut 11:29-30 (cf. Judg 9:6.37; cf. also Josh 24:26); and the motif of the land of Canaan as given to Abram's descendants (Gen 12:7 et al.) originates from Deut 34:4.

Accordingly, the account of Abram being led by Yahweh to the Promised Land (Gen 12:1-8) in a narrative, easily understandable, universalistic, and undoubtedly pacific way illustrates the rhetorical-theological, monolatrous, potentially militant ideas of Deut 6:1-19.

---

111 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 88.

112 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 279; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 133.

113 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 279.

114 This fact implies that Genesis, like Deuteronomy, presents a distinctively Israelite (and not a Judaean) viewpoint on the issue of Yahweh's chosen place of worship.

2.7 Being in a miraculous way freed from Pharaoh's rule in Egypt (Gen 12:9-20; cf. Deut 6:20-25)

The idea of being in a miraculous way freed from Pharaoh's rule in Egypt (Gen 12:9-20) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 6:20-25.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 12:9-20 and Deut 6:20-25 is provided by several common key words of both texts, namely מצרים ('Egypt': Gen 12:10-11.14; Deut 6:21-22), יטב\טוב ('go well / good': Gen 12:13.16; Deut 6:24; cf. also 6:18), חיה ('live': Gen 12:13; Deut 6:24), פרעה ('Pharaoh': Gen 12:15.17-18.20; Deut 6:21-22), בית ([Pharaoh's] 'house' [divinely punished]: Gen 12:15.17; Deut 6:22), and גדלים ('great' [signs against Egypt]: Gen 12:17; Deut 6:22).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 12:9-20 and Deut 6:20-25 is quite easy to ascertain. The reference to Israel as being in a miraculous way freed from Pharaoh's rule in Egypt (Deut 6:20-25) constitutes an integral part of the narrative of Deuteronomy. On the other hand, the account of Abram's travel to Egypt soon after his coming to Canaan (Gen 12:9-20) is quite strange in the narrative logic of Genesis because it follows the story concerning Yahweh's command to go to Canaan, Yahweh's promise that precisely this land will be given to Abram's offspring, and Abram's proper worship of Yahweh in Canaan (Gen 12:1-8; esp. 12:1.7-8).[115] Moreover, the idea of Abram as bringing an affliction upon Egypt (Gen 12:17) stands in contradiction to the previously expressed idea that Abram will be a blessing for all nations (Gen 12:2-3).

Accordingly, the strange in itself account of Abram being in a miraculous way freed from Pharaoh's rule in Egypt (Gen 12:9-20) is thematically based on the Deuteronomic reference to Israel as having been in a miraculous way freed from Pharaoh's rule in Egypt (Deut 6:20-25; esp. 6:21-22).

In particular, in his reworking of the Deuteronomic reference to Egypt (Gen 12:10-11.14; cf. Deut 6:21-22), the author of Genesis avoided the idea that believers in Yahweh became slaves in that country (cf. Deut 6:21). Consequently, his presentation of Abram as temporarily dwelling in Egypt as an alien (Gen 12:10) is quite positive in terms of a narrative description of Israel's beginnings.

---

115 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 137.

For the same reason, Abram's sixty-five-year-old wife (cf. Gen 12:4; 17:17) is presented in Gen 12:11.14 as a very beautiful woman.[116]

The strange in itself description of Abram's deliberations as referring first to everything being well with him and then to his being kept alive because of his wife (Gen 12:13; cf. 12:16)[117] illustrates the Deuteronomic promise that the Israelites will be well-to-do people and that they will be kept alive because of their faithful observance of Yahweh's statutes (Deut 6:24; cf. also 6:18 et al.). The surprising presentation of Abram's elderly wife as a very beautiful woman (Gen 12:11.14)[118] probably also reflects this theological idea.

The likewise strange idea that Abram's wife was immediately taken to Pharaoh's house and that she became Pharaoh's wife (Gen 12:15.19) in fact alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites were slaves in Pharaoh's house (Deut 6:21-22).[119] The honorific reworking of this Deuteronomic idea in Gen 12:15-16.19 is fairly evident.

The motif of great plagues which were inflicted by Yahweh on Pharaoh and his house (Gen 12:17) was borrowed from Deut 6:22. However, in Genesis this motif was reworked in such a way that the reader should have no doubt that the plagues were merited because of Pharaoh's in fact unlawful behaviour, since he took himself another man's wife (Gen 12:17-19).[120] Consequently, the author of Genesis reformulated the militant idea of Yahweh as punishing Egypt into a pacific and widely understandable one, namely that of the prohibition of violating universally acknowledged moral laws concerning marriage.

---

116 It seems that on the second ('successional': Gen 12-50) and third ('Abraham-biographic': Gen 12:1-25:10) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the character of Abram's wife (and consequently his 'helper': cf. Gen 2:18-24) alludes to the Israelite, positively presented helpers of Moses (Deut 1:9-18).

117 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 2, 139.

118 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 288; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 137.

119 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 138.

120 On the other hand, the Pharaoh is presented in Gen 12:18-19 as not guilty of violation of the marriage law, *pace* Y. Peleg, 'Was the Ancestress of Israel in Danger? Did the Pharaoh Touch (נגע) Sarai?', *ZAW* 118 (2006) 197-208. The author of Genesis carefully avoids blaming the Egyptians for the fact that the Israelites were once slaves in their country. Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 385-386; J. Joosten, 'Abram et Saraï en Égypte: Composition et message de Genèse 12, 10-20', in M. Arnold, G. Dahan, and A. Noblesse-Rocher (eds.), *La sœur-épouse (Genèse 12, 10-20)* (Études d'histoire de l'exégèse 1; Cerf: Paris 2010), 11-25 (esp. 23-24).

The concluding statement concerning Abram as being respectfully sent back from Egypt to Canaan (Gen 12:20) reflects the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites were brought back from Egypt to Canaan thanks to Yahweh's humiliation of Egypt (Deut 6:22-23). Once more, pacific and honorific reworking of a Deuteronomic idea is here fairly evident.

Accordingly, in Gen 12:9-20 the author of Genesis reworked the militant ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 6:20-25 in a pacific and honorific way. Moreover, he substituted the specific, Israelite exhortations to observe Yahweh's statutes with the general idea of not violating universally acknowledged moral laws concerning marriage.

2.8 Fighting a just war and establishing peace with the Gentiles in Canaan (Gen 13-15; cf. Deut 7)

The combination of the ideas of fighting a just war, overcoming more numerous Gentile kings, being liberated from the power of oppressors, being blessed by God, establishing peace with the Gentiles in Canaan, not coveting spoils, not establishing family relationships with the Canaanites, and Yahweh's making a promise (Gen 13-15) structurally corresponds to a similar combination in Deut 7.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 13-15 and Deut 7 is provided by numerous common key words of both texts: ארץ ([promised] 'land': Gen 13:6-7.9.12.15.17; 15:7.18; Deut 7:1), כנעני ('Canaanites': Gen 13:7; 15:21; Deut 7:1), פרזי ('Perizzites': Gen 13:7; 15:20; Deut 7:1), בוא ('come' [to the Promised Land]: Gen 13:18; Deut 7:1), מלך ([Gentile] 'king' [in Canaan]: Gen 14:1-2.5.8-10.17-18.21-22; Deut 7:24), נכה ('defeat' [Gentile enemies]: Gen 14:5.7.15.17; Deut 7:2), הנשארים ('the ones remaining' [from destruction in the battle]: Gen 14:10; Deut 7:20), לקח ('take' [spoils]: Gen 14:11-12.21.23-24; Deut 7:25), ברוך ('blessed' [among nations]: Gen 14:19-20; Deut 7:14), נתן ('deliver' [Gentile enemies]: Gen 14:20; Deut 7:2.16.23-24), הרבה ('make numerous': Gen 15:1; Deut 7:13), אמן ('believe' [Yahweh]: Gen 15:6; Deut 7:9), ירש ('take possession' [of the Promised Land]: Gen 15:7-8; Deut 7:1), ברית ([Yahweh's] 'covenant': Gen 15:18; Deut 7:9.12), חתי ('Hittites': Gen 15:20; Deut 7:1), גרגשי ('Girgashites': Gen 15:21; Deut 7:1), אמרי ('Amorites': Gen 15:21; Deut 7:1), and יבוסי ('Jebusites': Gen 15:21; Deut 7:1).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 13-15 and Deut 7 is relatively easy to ascertain. The particular behaviour of Abram after the battle (Gen 14:22-24) illustrates two originally distinct ideas of 'devouring' enemies (Deut 7:16) and of not coveting their possessions (Deut 7:25). Moreover, the intriguing image of Abram as having the Aramaean Eliezer as his closest kinsman (Gen 15:2; cf. Deut 26:5; Gen 25:20 etc.; diff. Gen 14:12.16) may be regarded as illustrating the thought that the chosen people should not establish family relationships with the Canaanites (Deut 7:3), but not vice versa.

The thematically complex section concerning Abram's parting ways with Lot in the land of Canaan; Abram's engaging in war and establishing peace with the Gentiles in Canaan; and Yahweh's making a covenant with Abram, a covenant which refers to the land of Canaan (Gen 13-15), narratively illustrates therefore the ideas of the section of Deuteronomy which concerns making a holy war against the Gentiles in Canaan (Deut 7).

In particular, the story about Abram as parting ways with Lot in the land of Canaan (Gen 13) presents a thoroughly reworked version of the image of Canaan and its Gentile inhabitants which may be found in Deut 7:1.[121] In his narrative, the author of Genesis in a quite surprising way (suggesting that there was not enough pasture in Canaan for the flocks of Abram and Lot: Gen 13:6)[122] used the widely understandable motifs of tension between the more greedy and ambitious younger generation and the more wealthy and peaceable older one (Gen 13:2.5.8-11), not enough room for two adult males in the same space (Gen 13:6), clashes between two groups of shepherds in one pasture (Gen 13:7), family strife (Gen 13:8), etc.[123]

With the use of these motifs, the author of Genesis presented the land of Canaan as inhabited not by seven mighty and numerous Gentile nations (Deut 7:1) but by merely two groups of relatively harmless people: the 'local' Canaanites and the 'open village' Perizzites (cf. Deut 3:5; 1 Sam 3:18; Esth 9:19),[124] who lived in the region of Shechem (Gen 13:7; cf. 34:10; Judg 1:4-5; 17:15). Their only moral fault consisted in engaging in strife, which could be regarded as natural for shepherds (Gen 13:7). Moreover, the author of Genesis presented the land of Canaan (Gen 13:9) as including the more fertile but spiritually poor

---

121 Cf. G. Hepner, *Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel* (StBL 78; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2010), 104-105.

122 Cf. ibid. 106-108.

123 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 140.

124 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 296.

‘outskirts of Canaan’ (i.e. the lowlands in the east: Gen 13:10-11.12b-13; cf. Deut 34:3) and the less fertile but spiritually rich ‘Canaan proper’ (i.e. the highlands: Gen 13:12a.14-18).[125] In this way, he alluded to the Deuteronomic idea of various degrees of intensity of the Israelites’ relationship with Yahweh and with his chosen sanctuary that was located in the heart of Canaan (and not in Transjordan), in the region of Shechem (cf. Deut 2:24-3:17; 3:18-28:69).[126] Besides, the author of Genesis suggested that only some of the inhabitants of Canaan, namely those who lived in the ‘outpost’ of Sodom (Gen 13:12; cf. 10:19), were evil, and consequently meriting destruction (Gen 13:10.13; cf. 18:16-19:28). In this way, he reworked the militant, nationalist ideology of holy war against the Canaanites (Deut 7:1-2)[127] into a morally much more sensitive one. The conclusion of the story, which refers to Abram building an altar to Yahweh in the ‘Amorite’ southern borderland of Hebron (Gen 13:18; cf. 14:13; cf. Deut 1:7.19-20 etc.),[128] may be regarded as illustrating the Israelites’ ambiguous attitude towards Judaea.[129]

---

125 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26* (NAC 1B; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2005), 136-137; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 140-141.

126 The motif of seeing the whole land which was promised to Abraham (Gen 13:14-15) originates from Deut 1:7-8. It seems that on the second (‘successional’: Gen 12-50) and third (‘Abraham-biographic’: Gen 12:1-25:10) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy the character of Lot, who despised the land of Canaan proper (Gen 13:10-13), alludes to the sinful generation of the Israelites, who likewise despised the Promised Land (Deut 1:26-27).

127 Cf. E. H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy* (NAC 4; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 1994), 177-180.

128 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 142 n. 43.

129 It should be noted that the remark concerning Hebron should be interpreted in the context of Hebron’s evident peripheral and not central location in Canaan (cf. Gen 13:14; cf. similarly 26:25; diff. 12:6-8; 13:3-4). Moreover, in Genesis there is no mention of building an altar to Yahweh in Jerusalem (diff. Gen 12:6-8; 13:18; 22:9; 26:25; 33:18-20; 35:1-7; cf. also Josh 14:13-14; 20:7; Judg 1:20-21 etc.); cf. B. T. Arnold, Genesis, 144. Consequently, Gen 13:18 may be regarded as only partially conciliatory as concerns Israel’s relationship with Judaea and its unquestioned political-religious capital. For this reason, the motif of the oaks of Mamre at Hebron in Judaea (אלני ממרא: Gen 13:18; cf. 14:13; 18:1), a motif in which the otherwise unknown name Mamre may allude to the participle ממרים (‘rebellious’: Deut 9:7.24; 31:27 etc.), probably functions in Genesis as a negative counterpart of the Deuteronomic motif of the oaks of Moreh at Shechem in Israel (אלוני מרה: Deut 11:30; cf. Gen 12:6; cf. also Judg 9:6.37).

The subsequent story about Abram engaging in a war against Gentile kings in Canaan and about his peaceful dealing with Melchizedek and with the king of Sodom (Gen 14) provides a direct answer of the author of Genesis to the problem of the holy war against the Gentiles in Canaan (Deut 7; cf. also 1:28-30 etc.).[130] The quasi-legendary story about a war between two groups of Gentile kings (Gen 14:1-10)[131] assures the reader that it was not the Israelite Abram but some Gentile invaders who initiated the war in Canaan (Gen 14:1-2a.5-7).[132] Moreover, it was not the Israelite Abram but the evil and rebellious rulers of the region of Sodom (cf. Gen 13:13; cf. also Hos 11:8; Am 4:11; Is 1:9-10; Jer 23:14; Deut 29:22 etc.)[133] who waged the war against the aggressors (Gen 14:2.8-9). In this way, the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites' war in Canaan had to be fought against mightier and more numerous Gentiles (Deut 7:1). He took the most important motifs of the Deuteronomic text, especially those of making war against Canaanite kings, defeating Canaanite enemies, and causing to disappear the Canaanites who remained alive after the battle (Deut 7:24.2.20), and thoroughly reformulated them in order to blame the Gentiles and not the Israelites for initiating the war in the Promised Land.

The account of Abram liberating Lot from Gentile captivity (Gen 14:11-16) gives a narrative reason for the Israelite engagement in the war. According to this account, Abram was provoked to go to war because he felt obliged to liberate his close relative from captivity (Gen 14:11-14.16). Besides, Abram is

---

130 Otherwise, since Gen 14 is rather strange in its literary context, it could be considered a later scribal addition, as it is argued by G. Granerød, *Abraham and Melchizedek: Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110* (BZAW 406; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2010), 249-253.

131 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 145-146.

132 The names of the peoples and of some of the places which are mentioned in Gen 14:5-7 (cf. 1QapGen 21:29 for זמזמים) were borrowed from Deut 1:4.19; 2:10-12.20.22; 25:17.19. All of them point to the regions of Bashan, Moab and Edom; cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 142-144. In this way, the author of Genesis suggests that Canaan proper was somehow divinely protected from the invasion of the Gentile rulers.

133 It should be noted that even the names of these rulers etymologically suggest their being evil, wicked, hating (leg. שׂנאב), and going astray (leg. שׂמאבד Gen 14:2 SP, 1QapGen 21:25). Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 309; B. Ziemer, *Abram – Abraham: Kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Genesis 14, 15 und 17* (BZAW 350; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2005), 106-109.

presented in Gen 14:13 as being capable of living in peace with his Canaanite neighbours.[134] Accordingly, the author of Genesis used the Deuteronomic motifs of the Israelites being liberated from the power of oppressors and of their overcoming more numerous Gentile kings in Canaan (Deut 7:7-8.17-19.24) in order to reformulate the ideology of the holy war against the Canaanites (Deut 7) into the idea of being obliged by the universal moral law to fight a just, defensive war. The particular description of the battlefield in which Abram pursued and defeated the Gentile enemies as extending from Hebron in the south to Dan and the border of Damascus in the north (Gen 14:13-15) evidently reflects the prophetic-Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites were summoned to conquer the whole land of Canaan: from the border of Damascus and Dan in the north to the Negeb in the south (Ezek 48:1-28; Deut 34:1-3).

The account of Abram's encounter with the king of Sodom and with Melchizedek (Gen 14:17-24)[135] provides yet another answer to the question of the holy war against the Canaanites (Deut 7). Having borrowed the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites will be blessed by God among other nations especially in grain and new wine (in the context of the holy war: Deut 7:13-14), the author of Genesis created the account of Melchizedek who brought out bread and wine, and who blessed Abram (Gen 14:18-20). The narrative character of Melchizedek represents, in contrast to the Deuteronomic ideology of the holy war, 'good' Canaanites, who are well disposed towards the Israelites and their faith.[136] This character is described as Melchizedek (i.e. 'My king is righteousness'),[137] king of Shalem (i.e. 'peace': cf. similarly Gen 34:21),[138] and a Gentile but monola-

---

134 However, the idea of Abram as making a covenant (ברית) with the Canaanites at Hebron (Gen 14:13; cf. 13:18) stands in direct contradiction to the Deuteronomic order Deut 7:2. For this reason, it is reasonable to suppose that the Israelite author of Genesis wanted to present Judaea as the region in which such unorthodox dealings with the Gentiles take place (cf. Gen 21:27.32; 26:28.34-35; cf. also Josh 15:63; Judg 1:21).

135 For a clue to the identification of the King's Valley as located in the region of Sodom (Gen 14:17), see Num 20:17.22.

136 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 322.

137 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 148.

138 Cf. Ps 85:11. There is no hint in Gen 14:17-21 that Shalem, which is mentioned in the text in the context of Sodom, should be identified with Jerusalem: cf. O. Margalith, 'The Riddle of Genesis 14 and Melchizedek', *ZAW* 112 (2000) 501-508 (esp. 506-508); *pace* Y. Amit, 'Epoch and Genre: The Sixth Century and the Growth of Hidden Polemics', in O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2003), 135-151 (esp. 143-144).

trous (significantly, not offering slaughtered and burnt sacrifices: cf. Gen 4:3; diff. Gen 8:20; 22:2-13; 31:54; 46:1) priest of God Most High who made heaven and earth (Gen 14:18-19).[139] Melchizedek does not know the name of Yahweh (Gen 14:19-20; diff. 14:22), but he confesses in a quasi-Deuteronomic way that it is God Most High who has delivered Abram's enemies into his hands (Gen 14:20; cf. Deut 7:2.16.23-24). In response, Abram respectfully recognizes Melchizedek's Gentile virtues, social position, priestly function, offering, blessing, and profession of faith by giving him a tithe of all (Gen 14:20). In this way, the author of Genesis significantly corrected the militant Deuteronomic ideology of destruction of the Canaanite Gentiles together with all their religious institutions (Deut 7:1-2.5.16-25).

The conclusion of the story, which describes Abram's encounter with the Canaanite king of Sodom (Gen 14:21-24), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should neither covet nor take spoils during the war with the Canaanite kings (Deut 7:24-25). In this respect, Abram is contrasted in Gen 14:16.20.22-24 with his Gentile enemies (Gen 14:11-12), with the evil Canaanite king (Gen 14:21), and with his Canaanite allies (Gen 14:24). Additionally, the somewhat surprisingly introduced idea that the young warriors should be repaid for what they have eaten during the war (Gen 14:24) may reflect the Deuteronomic idea of 'devouring' Gentile enemies (Deut 7:16).

The story which concludes this section (Gen 15) further illustrates the ideas of Deut 7. The surprisingly introduced, military motif of Yahweh as Abram's shield (Gen 15:1) originates from Deut 33:29 and illustrates the idea of Yahweh as the protector of the Israelites (Deut 7:8.15.18-19).[140] The related motif of Yahweh's very great reward for Abram (Gen 15:1) originates from Deut 7:9.12-14.[141] The likewise surprising image of Abram as having the Damascene Eliezer

---

The names and places which are mentioned in Gen 14:1-24 generally have purely symbolic functions. Moreover, Jerusalem is never mentioned in Genesis. If the author of this Israelite writing wanted to present Jerusalem in a positive, conciliatory way as a place of proper pre-Mosaic worship, he would have made it in a way comparable to Gen 12:7-8; 13:18; 22:1-18; 26:25; 33:20; 35:1-7. For an analysis of ancient suggestions that Shalem should be identified with Shechem, see Y. Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2, *A Temple City* (JSP 8; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2008), 151-152.

139 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 148.

140 It is possible that also the name Eliezer (אליעזר: Gen 15:2) alludes to the idea of Yahweh as the Israelites' help (עזר: Deut 33:29).

141 The prophetic-theophanic motif of Yawheh's word coming to Abram after other events (time reference + היה דבר־יהוה אל: Gen 15:1; cf. also 15:4) was borrowed from Ezek

as his closest heir (Gen 15:2-3), which stands in contradiction to the earlier description of Abram as having with him his nephew Lot (Gen 14:12.16), with the use of the motif of the Aramaeans (and hence the Damascenes: cf. Am 1:5; Is 7:8; 17:3 etc.) as the closest kinsfolk of the Israelites (Deut 26:5; cf. also Gen 22:20-23; 25:20; 28:5; 31:20.24) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not establish family relationships with the inhabitants of Canaan (Deut 7:3).[142]

The interrelated promises that Abram's offspring (presumably born in Canaan: diff. Gen 15:2-3) will inherit everything which he has (Gen 15:4) and that Abram will inherit the land of Canaan (Gen 15:7-8.18-21) illustrate the Deuteronomic promise that the Israelites will inherit the land of Canaan (Deut 7:1 etc.). The additional motif of Abram's descendants being as numerous as the stars in heaven (Gen 15:5; cf. 22:17; 26:4) was borrowed from Deut 1:10; 10:22; 28:62. The statement concerning Abram as believing in Yahweh (Gen 15:6), which is thematically and linguistically based on Deut 1:32, corresponds to the idea of Yahweh as being faithful to the Israelites (Deut 7:9). The subsequent statement that Abram's faith (in the context of Yahweh's promise of the land: Gen 15:7.18-21) was reckoned to him as righteousness (Gen 15:6)[143] most probably reflects the thought that the Israelites inherit the land of Canaan not because of their righteousness but because of Yahweh's oath to Abraham (Deut 9:4-6).

The description of Yahweh's covenant with Abram (Gen 15:9-18) narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of Yawheh's covenant with Israel (Deut 7:9.12; cf. also 7:2 et al.). The idea of the Israelites' return to the land of Canaan in the fourth generation (Gen 15:16) is based on that of Yahweh's punishment as

---

1:1-3. Likewise, the particular term denoting a vision (מחזה: Gen 15:1), somewhat surprisingly used in the context of an audible revelation, was borrowed from Ezek 13:7.

142 Lot is here treated as spiritually and morally defiled, and hence unfit to be Abram's heir, because of his connections with the evil inhabitants of Sodom (cf. Gen 13:12-13; 14:12). Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 154. On the second ('successional': Gen 12-50) and third ('Abraham-biographic': Gen 12:1-25:10) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the character of Lot alludes to the sinful generation of the Israelites, who despised the Promised Land, and for this reason they were forbidden from inheriting the land of Canaan (Deut 1:35). Correspondingly, the promised heir (Gen 15:4-19) stands for the younger, innocent generation of the Israelites, who replaced the defiled 'men of war' (Deut 1:39; 2:16.24; cf. Gen 14-15).

143 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 330; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 168.

extending to the third and fourth generation (Deut 5:9).[144] The strange ritual of only Yahweh passing like smoke and like a torch between cattle-type and winged animals (Gen 15:17; diff. Jer 34:18-20 et al.: people passing between parts of cattle)[145] reflects prophetic theophanic motifs (Is 6:2-4; Ezek 1:13).[146] The description of the borders of the Promised Land as reaching from the river of Egypt[147] to the great river, the river Euphrates (עד־הנהר הגדול נהר־פרת: Gen 15:18) was borrowed from Deut 1:7. The list of ten Canaanite nations (Gen 15:19-21) originates from Deut 7:1, with the omission of the Hivites and with the addition of four other tribes, most probably in order to allude to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' conquest of the eastern territories in Transjordan (Deut 2:24-3:17).[148]

Accordingly, the author of Genesis thoroughly reworked the nationalist and politically dangerous ideology of the holy war in Canaan (Deut 7) into a set of episodes, which presents the ancestor of the Israelites as a man of goodwill, peace, honesty, and hope (Gen 13-15).

---

144 For this reason, also the calculation of the time of the Israelites' captivity as amounting to 400 years (Gen 15:13; increased in Exod 12:40-41 to convey the idea of a new, innocent, 'fifth' generation) with the use of the motif of longeval patriarchs (cf. Gen 21:5 et al.) illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of the punishment extending up to the fourth generation (Deut 5:9). Besides, the strange in itself idea of the guilt of the Amorites (Gen 15:16), which functions as a code reference to the guilt of the Israelites before their return to the land of Canaan, probably alludes to the idea of the sin of the rebellious generation of the Israelites in the land of the Amorites (Deut 1:27.44; cf. also Ezek 16:3.45).

145 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 430-433; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 159-160.

146 Cf. also the earlier use of the prophetic theophanic motif which was borrowed from Ezek 1:3 in Gen 15:1.4. For this reason, the strange in itself idea of taking three three-year-old (or 'three-storeyed': מְשֻׁלֶּשׁ; cf. Ezek 42:6) animals of differing size, as well as two pair-winged animals of differing extension of their wings (Gen 15:9), originates from a conflation of the prophetic-theophanic descriptions of 'three-storeyed' creatures (Is 6:2) and two-pair-winged creatures (Ezek 1:11).

147 The strange in itself term 'River of Egypt' (Gen 15:18) most probably originates from a conflation of the names 'River' (i.e. Euphrates) and 'Brook of Egypt' (cf. Is 27:12).

148 The name of the Kenites (הקיני: Gen 15:19) may allude to Cain (קין) and his dwelling east of Eden (Gen 4:16). The name Kadmonites (Gen 15:19) simply means 'easterners'. For the Rephaim (Gen 15:20) as conquered in Transjordan, see Deut 3:11.13.

2.9 Yahweh testing his believers and caring for them in the wilderness (Gen 16; cf. Deut 8)

The ideas concerning Yahweh as testing his believers and as caring for them in the wilderness (Gen 16) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 8.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 16 and Deut 8 is provided by several common key words of both texts: שׁנה ('years' [of Yahweh's testing]: Gen 16:3.16; Deut 8:2.4), ישׁב ('dwell' [in Canaan]: Gen 16:3; Deut 8:12), ענה ('humble' [in the wilderness]: Gen 16:6.9; Deut 8:2-3.16), מים ('water' [in the wilderness]: Gen 16:7; Deut 8:15), מדבר ([humbling] 'wilderness': Gen 16:7; Deut 8:2.15-16), דרך ('way' [of God leading in the wilderness]: Gen 16:7; Deut 8:2), and רבה ('multiply' [in the Promised Land]: Gen 16:10; Deut 8:1.13).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 16 and Deut 8 is not easy to ascertain. However, the hypothesis that the particular motif of the Egyptian slave-girl (Gen 16:1.3) is a result of a negative reworking of the well-known scriptural motif of the Israelites as slaves in Egypt (Deut 8:14) is more plausible than the hypothesis of the reverse direction of literary dependence.

Therefore, the somewhat surprisingly introduced story about Sarai's slave-girl Hagar and about Yahweh's providential care of her in the wilderness (Gen 16) illustrates the main idea of Deut 8, namely that of remembering Yahweh's providential care of the Israelites in the wilderness.

In particular, the character of the Egyptian slave-girl (Gen 16:1.3; cf. 12:16)[149] functions in Genesis as a negative allusion to the Deuteronomic image of the Israelites as having once lived in the land of Egypt, in the house of slavery (Deut 8:14; cf. 28:68).[150] Likewise, the particular name Hagar (הגר: 'the stranger') alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Israel was a stranger (גר) in the land of Egypt (Deut 10:19; cf. also 23:8).[151] In this way, the author of Genesis increased the reputation and national pride of the Israelites, by presenting them as free, legal owners of at least some of their main historical enemies, the Egyptians.

---

149 The description of Hagar as an Egyptian and as a slave-girl is repeated in Gen 16:1.3 in a narratively redundant way, in order to draw attention to these particular details.

150 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 179; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 164. For this reason, in Gen 16 Hagar is consistently and repeatedly termed שׁפחה (Gen 16:1-3.5-6.8; cf. Deut 28:68) and not אמה (cf. Gen 21:10.12-13).

151 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 184; G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 192-193.

The narratively strange description of Abram's consent to Sarai's plan, namely as resulting from simply obeying the voice of his wife (שׁמע + קול: Gen 16:2), alludes to the Deuteronomic exhortation that the Israelites should obey the voice of Yahweh their God (Deut 8:20). Consequently, the author of Genesis presented Abram as obeying the will of God which was communicated to him through the agency of his own wife.

The surprisingly introduced remark concerning ten years of Abram's dwelling in the land of Canaan (Gen 16:3; cf. 16:16), which suggests that he waited ten years for the fulfilment of Yahweh's promise concerning his offspring and inheritance (Gen 12:7 etc.),[152] narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites were humbled and tested for forty years before their came to dwell in the land of Canaan (Deut 8:2-4.7-10.12.16).

The descriptions of Hagar and Sarai (both of them now regarded as Abram's wives: Gen 16:3) as becoming arrogant and forgetting that they were once slaves (Gen 16:4-6; cf. 16:1-3; 12:15)[153] in commonly understandable terms illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should neither exalt themselves in their hearts nor forget Yahweh their God who brought them out of the house of slavery (Deut 8:14).

The image of Hagar as being humbled by her mistress (Gen 16:6; cf. 16:9) alludes to the Israelites being humbled by Yahweh in the wilderness (Deut 8:2-3.16). The related image of Hagar as being found by Yahweh's angel (or Yahweh himself: cf. Gen 16:13) by a spring of water in the wilderness, on the way to Shur (שׁור), which is located between Egypt and Canaan (Gen 16:7; cf. 25:18), is thematically based on the Deuteronomic description of the Israelites as being led by Yahweh on the way through the wilderness (Deut 8:2), in which Yahweh brought water for them out of flint rock (צור: Deut 8:15).[154] The idea of Yahweh as finding (מצא) people in the wilderness in order to lead their ways (Gen 16:7) is likewise prophetic-Deuteronomic (cf. Hos 9:10; Deut 32:10).

The promise that Yahweh will greatly multiply Hagar's offspring, so that her humiliation will eventually lead to her good (Gen 16:10-12), originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic motifs of Yahweh's multiplying the Israelites (Deut 8:1; cf. 8:13) and of the Israelites' humiliation in the wilderness, regarded

---

152 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* (WBC 2; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1994), 8.

153 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 164.

154 For this reason, the thought that Hagar was found by a spring (i.e. a place of water flowing out of a rock) is redundantly repeated in Gen 16:7, in contrast to the subsequent remark which more naturally refers to a well with water (Gen 16:14).

as eventually leading to their good (Deut 8:16). The strange in themselves ideas that in the wilderness Hagar saw God after he had seen her (Gen 16:13) and that the well in the wilderness was called Lahai-roi, which means ‘For life he sees me’ (Gen 16:14),[155] illustrate the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites in the wilderness knew Yahweh’s providential care of them, which led to their remaining alive, after his having known what was in their hearts (Deut 8:2-3).[156]

Accordingly, in Gen 16 the author of Genesis presented the profoundly theological ideas of Deut 8 in the form of an easily understandable, folkloristic narrative about family and social tensions.

2.10 Yahweh’s theophany and the covenant of circumcision (Gen 17; cf. Deut 9-10)

The ideas of Yahweh’s theophany and of the covenant of circumcision (Gen 17) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 9-10.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 17 and Deut 10:12-22. It is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: זרע אחרי (‘descendants after [you]’: Gen 17:7-10.19; Deut 10:15), שׁמר (‘keep’ [what is ordered]: Gen 17:9-10; Deut 10:13), מול (‘circumcise’ [as a sign of the covenant]: Gen 17:10-14.23-27; Deut 10:16), and ערלה (‘foreskin’ [to be circumcised]: Gen 17:11.14.23-25; Deut 10:16).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 17 and Deut 10:12-22 is not easy to ascertain. The order to circumcise one’s heart (Deut 10:16) seems to have originated from the order to circumcise the flesh of one’s foreskin (Gen 17:11.14.23-25). However, the section concerning the covenant of circumcision (Gen 17) is quite surprisingly located in the narrative of Genesis. As an account of Yahweh’s covenant with Abram, it seems to duplicate the main idea of the preceding account Gen 15.[157] Moreover, it is located after the account of the birth of Ishmael (Gen 16) and not after that of Isaac (Gen 21:1-7), although it is Isaac and not Ishmael who is presented in Genesis as the heir and partner of Yahweh’s covenant with Abraham (Gen 17:1-9.16.18-21; cf. 21:9-13;

---

155 Cf. J. Krašovec, *The Transformation of Biblical Proper Names* (LHBOTS 418; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 13.

156 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 110-112.

157 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 168-169.

26:24-25).[158] Besides, circumcision was well known also outside Israel, especially in Egypt (cf. Jer 9:24-25; Ezek 32:29; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.36-37; 2.104),[159] a fact which implies that Deut 10:16 (cf. also 30:6) alludes to this widespread cultural practice and not to Gen 17 with its artificial presentation of circumcision as peculiar to the descendants of Abraham (with no mention of the Egyptians etc.).

These facts suggest that the section concerning the covenant of circumcision (Gen 17), which presents Yahweh's covenant with Abraham as being primarily spiritual-moral in its demands (Gen 17:1-8),[160] should be regarded as alluding to the Deuteronomic text Deut 10:12-22 (cf. also Jer 4:4), which refers to circumcision as an expression of the Israelites' unswerving loyalty to Yahweh, and not vice versa. Besides, a detailed intertextual analysis of Gen 17:1-8 reveals that it sequentially illustrates the contents of the cultic fragment Deut 9:1-10:11, which precedes the section Deut 10:12-22 in the text of Deuteronomy.

In particular, the anciently sounding self-identification of Yahweh as God Almighty (אל שׁדי: Gen 17:1; cf. 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; cf. also Exod 6:3) was borrowed from the theophanic text Ezek 10:5 in order to allude to the Deuteronomic texts which refer to Yahweh as a devouring fire (Deut 9:3) and to

---

158 Cf. T. Naumann, 'The Common Basis of the Covenant and the Distinction between Isaac and Ishmael in Gen 17: The Case of Ishmael and the Non-Israelite Descendants of Abraham in the Priestly Source', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (BZAR 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 89-109. The explanation proposed by D. A. Bernat, *Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in the Priestly Tradition* (AIIL 3; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta 2009), 34 namely that Ishmael is presented in Genesis as a foreigner, and for this reason he receives only a blessing but not a covenant (Gen 16:10-12; cf. 21:13.18), is unsatisfactory because it does not explain the presence of the motif of the covenant in Gen 17:1-9, so between the account of Ishmael's birth (Gen 16:1-16) and that of his circumcision (Gen 17:25-26).

159 Cf. P. J. King, 'Gezer and Circumcision', in S. Gitin, J. E. Wright, and J. P. Dessel (eds.), *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel*, Festschrift W. G. Dever (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2006), 333-340 (esp. 333-334); A. Ruwe, 'Beschneidung als interkultureller Brauch und Friedenszeichen Israels: Religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Genesis 17, Genesis 34, Exodus 4 und Josua 5', *TZ* 64 (2008) 309-342 (esp. 309, 311-312); V. Wagner, 'Profanität und Sakralisierung der Beschneidung im Alten Testament', *VT* 60 (2010) 447-464 (esp. 453-454, 458).

160 Cf. D. A. Bernat, *Sign*, 15-16.

Yahweh's Horeb theophany (Deut 9:8-15). Likewise, the particular exhortation directed to Abram, namely that he should walk before (לפני) Yahweh and be blameless (Gen 17:1), an exhortation which is in fact liturgical-cultic in its contents, originates from a reworking of the Deuteronomic texts concerning the ministry of Moses (Deut 9:9-10:5; 10:10-11; esp. 9:18.25: לפני יהוה), as well as that of the sons of Levi (Deut 10:6-9; esp. 10:8: לפני יהוה). The motif of the covenant (ברית), which is redundantly used throughout the section Gen 17:1-21 (Gen 17:2.4.7.9-11.13-14.19.21; diff. 15:18),[161] alludes to the repeatedly used motif of the covenant in Deut 9:9.11.15; 10:8.

The promise concerning Abram, namely that of making him numerous (רבה + אותך: Gen 17:2), is a reworking of a similar promise concerning Moses (Deut 9:14). The surprising image of Abram as twice falling (נפל) on his face (Gen 17:3.17; diff. 12:4.7; 15:2-3) reflects a similar image of Moses in Deut 9:18.25. The idea of God as saying (דבר: Gen 17:3) that Abram will become a father (אב) of numerous people (Gen 17:4-5) and that his name will be Abraham (אברהם: Gen 17:5)[162] was borrowed from Deut 9:5 (cf. also 9:27) and reworked in a clearly universalistic way.[163] The presentation of the cultic covenant (ברית) of circumcision as an everlasting covenant (Gen 17:7.13.19; cf. 9:12.16; diff. 15:18) is a result of a reworking of the idea that the tribe of Levi has been set apart in a covenantal way 'to this day' (Deut 10:8; cf. 33:8-9; cf. also 31:9-13). This idea was elaborated in Genesis with the use of the motif of descendants after the ancestor (Gen 17:7-10.19), a motif which was borrowed from Deut 10:15 (cf. 1:8; 4:37).[164] In this way, the author of Genesis presented all Israel as a cultic people (cf. Is 61:6; Exod 19:6). The subsequent statement concerning giving the land (נתן + ארץ: Gen 17:8), which is rather unexpectedly inserted into the ac-

---

161 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 169-170.

162 The name Abraham (אברהם: Gen 17:5 etc.), which is of course traditional (cf. Is 29:22; 41:8; 51:2; 63:16; Mi 7:20; Jer 33:26; Ezek 33:24), is etymologized in Gen 17:5 in an evidently artificial way (אב־המון).

163 The intertextual correspondence of the fragment Gen 17:4-6, which refers to Abraham as the father of a multitude of nations, to Deut 9:19-10:7 suggests that this universalistic idea of Genesis may illustrate the Deuteronomic texts concerning Israel's position among other nations (Deut 9:28) and concerning the Decalogue (Deut 10:1-5), which may be regarded as a fundamental, universally binding law.

164 The related reference to Yahweh's covenantal obligation 'to be God to you' (להיות לך לאלהים: Gen 17:7; cf. 17:8) was borrowed from Deut 26:17.

count of the promise concerning Abraham's offspring (Gen 17:2-21), illustrates the contents of Deut 10:11.[165]

The exhortation to keep God's covenant (Gen 17:9-10) is a reworking of a similar exhortation in Deut 10:12-13, which was reformulated in Gen 17:9-10 in easier to understand, less moral and more cultic terms. The thought that the main demand of God's covenant with Israel's ancestor and with his descendants after him concerns circumcision of the foreskins of all males in the community, which is surprisingly presented in Genesis as a distinctive feature of the community of Abraham's descendants among all the nations of the world (Gen 17:10-14; cf. 17:23-27; 21:4; 34:14-17.22-24; diff. Jer 9:24-25; Ezek 32:29; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.36-37; 2.104), is based on the Deuteronomic text Deut 10:15-16.[166] The author of Genesis reformulated the prophetic-Deuteronomic, symbolic-moral exhortation to circumcise the foreskin of the Israelites' hearts (Deut 10:16; cf. Jer 4:4; Deut 30:6; cf. also Jer 6:10)[167] into the easily understandable in the West Semitic world,[168] originally culturally motivated order to circumcise the flesh of the foreskin of the male body (Gen 17:10-14; cf. 17:23-27).[169]

Accordingly, the theophanic-moral, monolatrous ideas of Deut 9-10 were illustrated in Genesis in the form of an easily understandable, aetiological-etymological narrative, which presents the ritual of circumcision as a sign of Israel's fidelity to God's covenant with Abraham and with his descendants (Gen 17).

---

165 The explanatory motif of the land of Canaan as being given to Israel to be its possession (נתן + ארץ כנען + לאחזה: Gen 17:8) was borrowed from Deut 32:49.

166 The name of Abraham's son Isaac (Gen 17:19.21 etc.), artificially etymologized in Gen 17:17, was borrowed from Deut 9:5.27 (cf. 1:8; 6:10; 29:12; 30:20; 34:4; cf. earlier Am 7:9.16 [with no mention of Abraham]; Jer 33:26 [not yet a fixed datival formula]). Likewise, the name Sarah (Gen 17:15.17.19.21 etc.) was borrowed from Is 49:23; 51:2 ('princess').

167 Cf. P. C. Craigie, P. H. Kelley, and J. F. Drinkard, Jr., *Jeremiah 1-25* (WBC 26; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1991), 153-154; J. Wöhrle, 'The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *Foreigner*, 71-87 (esp. 72).

168 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 171-172.

169 The additional motif of Abraham and his wife's lack of faith (Gen 17:17-18; cf. 18:12-15; 21:6) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that even Moses did not always fully trust Yahweh (Deut 1:35-38; 3:25-28).

2.11 Israel’s intercession for Gentile sinners, God’s providence in the wilderness, and Israel’s possession and prosperity in the Promised Land (Gen 18-21; cf. Deut 11:1-25)

The ideas of Israel’s intercession for Gentile sinners, Yahweh’s destruction of sinful people, God’s providence in the wilderness, as well as Israel’s possession and prosperity in the Promised Land (Gen 18-21), structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 11:1-25.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 18-21 and Deut 11:1-7. It is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: בן (‘son’ [not knowing God’s chastening]: Gen 18:10.14; 21:2-5.7; Deut 11:2), עשׂה (‘do’ [Yahweh’s negative and positive miraculous deeds]: Gen 18:17.29-30; 19:22; 21:1.6; Deut 11:3-7), שׁמר (‘keep’ [Yahweh’s charge]: Gen 18:19; Deut 11:1), משׁפט ([Yahweh’s] ‘judgement’: Gen 18:19; Deut 11:1), המקום הזה (‘this place’ [at the Dead Sea]: Gen 19:13-14; Deut 11:5), ארץ (‘earth/land’ [as a place of punishment]: Gen 19:28; 20:1; Deut 11:3.6), ראה (‘see’ [Yahweh’s negative and positive miraculous deeds]: Gen 19:28; 21:19; Deut 11:2.7), מדבר (‘wilderness’ [as a place of chastisement and providence]: Gen 21:14.20-21; Deut 11:5), חזק (‘strong’ [hand]: Gen 21:18; Deut 11:2), יד ([saving] ‘hand’: Gen 21:18; Deut 11:2), and מצרים (‘Egypt’ [left behind]: Gen 21:21; cf. 21:9; cf. also 20:1-18; Deut 11:3-4).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 18-21 and Deut 11:1-7 is not easy to ascertain. However, the intriguing placement of the account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:16-19:29; cf. also 19:30-20:18) as interrupting the story about the birth of Isaac (Gen 18:1-15; 21:1-7) may be regarded as illustrating the motif of the children who have not seen Yahweh’s chastening in the wilderness (Deut 11:2-6), but not vice versa.

Moreover, a detailed intertextual analysis of Gen 18-21 and of the larger section Deut 11:1-25 reveals that the set of several thematically interrelated stories about (*a*) Abraham’s intercession in the face of Yahweh’s punishment of Gentile sinners, (*b*) God’s providence in the wilderness, and (*c*) Abraham’s possession and prosperity in the Promised Land (Gen 18-21) narratively illustrates the contents of the Deuteronomic text Deut 11:1-25 (cf. also 9:8-10:11).

In particular, the account of the announcement of the birth of Isaac (Gen 18:1-15) and then of the birth itself (Gen 21:1-7), which is quite strange in the context of the previously made announcement of Isaac’s birth (Gen 17:16.19.21)

and in its bipartite structure, which is interrupted by the account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:16-19:29) and of the punishment inflicted upon sinful people (Gen 20:1-18; cf. also 19:30-38), narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' children who have not seen Yahweh's chastening in the wilderness (Deut 11:2-6). The author of Genesis described Isaac as having been conceived (!) and born (Gen 21:2) already after Yahweh's punishment of sinful people in the desert surroundings of Canaan (Gen 18:16-20:18), and consequently as not being in a position to see this punishment.

The folkloristic-style account Gen 18:1-33 (esp. 18:16-33) depicts Abraham's priestly attitude towards Yahweh's punishing activity.[170] Being presented, similarly to Moses in Deuteronomy, as commanding his children to keep Yahweh's way and to make just judgements (Gen 18:19; cf. Deut 11:1),[171] Abraham reacts to Yahweh's plan to go down (ירד: Gen 18:21; cf. Deut 9:12.15) and punish the whole population of the sinful Gentiles (Gen 18:17.21.23; cf. Deut 11:2-4)[172] in a way which closely resembles that of Moses and the sons of Levi in the wilderness (Gen 18:22-33; cf. Deut 9:12-10:11). Although Abraham himself is promised to become a mighty nation (גוי + עצום: Gen 18:18; cf. Deut 9:24), he stands before Yahweh (עמד: Gen 18:8.22; 19:27; diff. 19:17; cf. Deut 10:8.10), blesses others (ברך: Gen 18:18; cf. Deut 10:8), and fivefold (פעם: Gen 18:32; cf. Deut 9:19; 10:10) intercedes before Yahweh (לפני יהוה: Gen 18:22; cf. Deut 9:18.25; 10:8)[173] on behalf of the sinful (חטא: Gen 18:20; cf. Deut 9:16.18.21.27) and wicked (רשע: Gen 18:23.25; cf. Deut 9:27) people who deserve to be destroyed (שחת: Gen 18:28.31-32; 19:13-14.29; cf. Deut 9:26).

Yahweh yields to this intercession, but the great sin of the people has to be severely punished (cf. Deut 9:18-21), which is illustrated with the use of the surprising image of an inner split within the Godhead (Gen 18:1-5.8-10): while

---

170 The priestly character of Abraham is first suggested by the particular description of his hospitality, namely as intending to offer Yahweh (or the three men) loaves made of three seahs (!) of fine flour (Gen 18:6; cf. Ezek 46:14 et al.: grain offering) and a tender and good calf (Gen 18:7; cf. Ezek 46:6 et al.: burnt offering) by the oaks of Mamre (Gen 18:1; cf. 13:8; cf. also Deut 11:29-12:28). Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 213 n. 392, 217.

171 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 181.

172 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 53, 63. It should be noted that the problem of evil in the world is presented in Gen 18:17-21 (cf. also 6:1-8:19 et al.) as mainly God's problem. The Israelite Abraham engages in solving this problem in a particular, priestly manner.

173 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 183.

the two men-angels go to Sodom[174] in order to judge it and punish it (Gen 18:16.22; 19:1-22), Yahweh heeds Abraham's conciliatory negotiation (Gen 18:17-21.23-33; cf. 19:19-22).[175] The number of men-angels who went to Sodom (two: Gen 19:1; cf. 18:2.6) reflects the Deuteronomic law concerning the number of witnesses who are necessary for legally convicting someone of a crime (Deut 17:6; 19:15).

The author of Genesis described the Sodomites' behaviour (Gen 19:1-11) in a way which justified Yahweh's eventual destruction of them, and which consequently illustrates the ideas of Deut 11:3-4. The Sodomites were Gentiles, and consequently they did not know God's commandments, but their behaviour broke even the most fundamental human moral conventions. All of them broke the code of hospitality (Gen 19:4-5; diff. 19:1-3.8), exhibited homosexual lust (Gen 19:5; cf. 18:8-9), wanted to violate their victims (Gen 19:5), rejected every appeasement (Gen 19:6-9), and oppressed the resident alien (Gen 19:9).[176] In this way, the author of Genesis conveyed the pacifistic idea that the Canaanite Gentiles could be divinely punished, but only in a most remote point of Canaan, in a limited number, for the most evident and universally abhorred moral transgressions, and after the Israelites' intense and prolonged intercessions on behalf of them (diff. Deut 7).

The description of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:12-26.29) was composed with the use of several Deuteronomic motifs which originated from the thematically corresponding section Deut 9:13-10:4 (cf. also 11:3-4). The author of Genesis depicted Lot as saved in Yahweh's greatness (גדל: Gen 19:19; cf. Deut 9:26) and because of Yahweh's remembering Abraham (זכר + אברהם: Gen 19:29; cf. Deut 9:27) by having been brought out (יצא: Gen 19:12; cf. 19:5-6.8.14.16-17; cf. Deut 9:26.28-29) with a mighty hand (יד +

174 The motif of the two sinful and destroyed cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:20; 19:24.28 etc.) is of course prophetic-Deuteronomic (cf. Am 4:11; Is 1:9-10; 13:19; Zeph 2:9; Jer 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Deut 32:32).

175 Cf. N. MacDonald, 'Listening to Abraham—Listening to Yhwh: Divine Justice and Mercy in Genesis 18:16-33', *CBQ* 66 (2004) 25-43 (esp. 41).

176 Cf. S. Morschauer, '"Hospitality", Hostiles and Hostages: On the Legal Background to Genesis 19.1-9', *JSOT* 27.4 (2003) 461-485; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 184; R. Hendel, C. Kronfeld, and I. Pardes, 'Gender and Sexuality', in R. Hendel (ed.), *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods* (Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2010), 71-91 (esp. 77-86). It is possible that the image of breaking (שׁבר) the door (Gen 19:9), which is presented as a culmination of the Sodomites' sins (Gen 19:5-9), alludes to breaking the tablets of the covenant (Deut 9:17; 10:2).

חזק: Gen 19:10.16; cf. Deut 9:26; 11:2) to the mountain (ההרה: Gen 19:17.19; cf. Deut 10:1.3)[177] from among the sinners whose cities were overthrown (הפך: Gen 19:21.25.29; cf. Deut 29:22) by a kind of divine stoning (cf. Deut 22:21.24 etc.) with brimstone (גפרית: Gen 19:24; cf. Deut 29:22) and fire from above (אשׁ: Gen 19:24; cf. Deut 9:15.21; 10:4), which also left pillars of salt (מלח: Gen 19:26; cf. Deut 29:22).[178] The concluding image of Abraham as seeing Yahweh's miraculous destruction of the sinful Gentile land (Gen 19:27-28) illustrates the ideas of Deut 11:2-3.6-7.

The account Gen 19:30-38, in difference to the preceding one (Gen 18:1-19:29) and to the subsequent one (Gen 20), contains no idea of Abraham's intercession for the Gentiles sinners. Consequently, it must have a special narrative function. In fact, it prepares the account of the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1-7). According to the narrative logic of the whole section Gen 19:30-21:34 Isaac was born not in Canaan proper (diff. Gen 16:3-16), but in the wilderness in the region of Kadesh and Beer-sheba, on the southern border of the land of Canaan, east of the Philistines and south-west of Moab and Ammon.[179] This surprising presentation of Isaac's place of birth illustrates the ideas of Deut 1:39-40.46; 2:1.9.16-19.23; 11:2. In the hypertextual logic of Gen 19:30-21:34 Isaac represents the Deuteronomic figure of the younger, innocent generation of the Israelites, who were born in the wilderness, in the region of Kadesh, on the southern border of the land of Canaan, east of Gaza, and south-west of Moab and Ammon

---

177 In the story of Genesis, Lot escaped first to Zoar (Gen 19:18-23), which was located on the border between the land of Canaan (cf. Deut 34:3) and the land of Moab (cf. Is 15:5; Jer 48:33-34). Thereafter, he moved eastward to the territories of Moab and Ammon, and was left there by the narrator (Gen 19:30-38).

178 It is possible that the remark concerning Lot's wife as looking back (Gen 19:17.26) alludes to the Greek myth of Orpheus and his wife Eurydice as escaping from the underworld; cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 185-186. Since Genesis was most probably written in the second half of the fifth century BC (cf. e.g. Gen 10:1-11:9), by that time the Israelites could already have known some elements of Greek culture, for example because of their military service in the Persian wars against the Greeks and because of the influence of Greek culture in Phoenicia. Cf. also the presence of Greek mythological motifs in the iconography of numerous seal rings used in the Persian province of Samaria: see e.g. M. J. W. Leith, *Wadi Daliyeh*, vol. 1, *The Wadi Daliyeh Seal Impressions* (DJD 24; Clarendon: Oxford 1997), 39-166.

179 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 150.

(Deut 1:39-40.46; 2:1.9.16-19.23).[180] In order to give a narrative reason for the Deuteronomy-based idea that the Israelites (and consequently Isaac) should avoid the territory of the Moabites and the Ammonites, who were descendants of Lot (Deut 2:9.19; cf. 23:3-6), the author of Genesis depicted the Moabites and the Ammonites as having been born in the aftermath of a grave sin (Gen 19:30-38).[181] Accordingly, these non-Israelite nations were presented in Genesis in a pacific way, as meriting not destruction but simply loathing.

The subsequent account of Abraham's stay in Gerar (Gen 20) illustrates the thematically related idea of violating another commandment of the Decalogue (Deut 9:9-10:5), namely that not to commit adultery (Deut 5:18). The narrative location of the story in Gerar (Gen 20:1-2),[182] which is the Negeb region of wadis (נחל: Gen 26:17.19), located between Egypt and Canaan (cf. Gen 10:19; 26:1-2), seems to allude to the journey (נסע) remark Deut 10:7 (cf. also 11:3-5). The strange in itself account of Abimelek's sin against the commandment of the Decalogue (חטא: Gen 20:6.9) narratively illustrates the idea of the Israelites' sin in the wilderness (Deut 9:16.18; cf. 9:21.27). The corresponding, particular description of Abraham's behaviour, namely as first praying on behalf of Abimelek (פלל בעד: Gen 20:7; cf. Deut 9:20) and then praying to God (פלל אל: Gen 20:17; cf. Deut 9:26) for the sinners (Gen 20:18), in difference to Abraham's passive role in Gen 12:19-20, alludes to the intercession of Moses and the sons of Levi to Yahweh on behalf of the sinful people (Deut 9:15-10:11).[183] In line with his theological ideas, the author of Genesis presented the Gentile Abimelek as being only apparently guilty of the attempted adultery (Gen 20:3.7-8.18), but in fact being innocent (Gen 20:4-6.9-10.14-16)[184] and heeding to God's warning

---

180 Correspondingly, with the use of the narrative characters of Ishmael as Isaac's half-brother (Gen 17:18-23 etc.) and Lot as his first cousin (Gen 11:27 etc.), the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic thought that the Edomites are the Israelites' brothers (Deut 2:4-8), and the Moabites and the Ammonites are their close relatives (Deut 2:9-23).

181 Cf. R. Hendel, C. Kronfeld, and I. Pardes, 'Gender', 87-90. *Pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1985), 228-230.

182 It should be noted that the name Gerar (גרר: Gen 20:1-2 etc.) has a symbolic meaning, which conveys the idea of dwelling as an alien (גור: Gen 20:1; 21:23.34 etc.): cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 150.

183 The description of Abraham as a prophet (נביא: Gen 20:7) alludes to the similar presentation of Moses in Deut 18:15.18; 34:10.

184 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 189-190.

which was revealed to him in a Gentile way (Gen 20:3-8),[185] contrary to the Israelite Abraham's prejudiced opinion about him (Gen 20:11).[186] Consequently, in Gen 20 the Deuteronomic idea of the divine punishment which had been inflicted upon the king of Egypt and upon his sinful people (Deut 11:3-4)[187] was reworked, with the use of the motifs borrowed from Deut 9:8-10:11, into the morally sensitive story about an individual, only attempted, in fact unconscious, and therefore not punishable, moral transgression.

The relatively short account of the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1-7),[188] which continues the narrative thread of Gen 18:1-15,[189] is followed by the much longer account of the expulsion of the Egyptian slave woman Hagar and of God's providential care of her in the wilderness (Gen 21:8-21). From the purely narratological point of view, the latter account seems to be redundant, as duplicating the motifs of the preceding story Gen 16.[190] In fact, however, it is a hypertextual reworking of the structurally corresponding Deuteronomic text which refers to the Israelites seeing Yahweh's providential care of them in the wilderness, after their going out of Egypt (Deut 11:5; cf. 11:2-4.7). The author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic motifs of Egypt as the land of slavery which was left behind, wilderness as the place of Yahweh's chastisement and providence, and seeing Yahweh miraculously acting with his mighty hand in the wilderness (Deut 11:2-5.7) into the pacific, quasi-folkloristic story about the Egyptian slave woman Hagar (Gen 21:9-13.21; cf. 16:1-6.8), who was chastised in the wilderness (Gen 21:14-16; diff. 16:7), but who also saw God's providential care for

---

185 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50* (NICOT; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 1995), 60-61.

186 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 150.

187 The name Abimelek (Gen 20:2-18 et al.), which means 'My father is king' (cf. Gen 20:2.9), alludes to the character of Pharaoh, the hereditary king of Egypt (Deut 11:3).

188 The remark concerning Abraham as being 100 years old at the time of the birth of his-not-his 'son of promise' (Gen 21:1-2.5) alludes to the age of the apparently childless Moses (Deut 1:37-38) at the time of the birth of the earlier promised (Deut 1:39), innocent generation of the Israelites. Since this generation was ready to fight a war when Moses was almost 120 years old (Deut 2:16.24; cf. 31:2), it must have been born in the wilderness when he was about 100 years old.

189 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 194.

190 Cf. N. Heinsohn, *Zwischen Verheißung und Verborgenheit: Studien zur Theologie und Anthropologie der Hagar-Erzählungen in Genesis 16 und 21* (BThSt 109; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010), 125-126 (cf. also 127-129).

her and for her son in the wilderness (Gen 21:14.17-21; cf. 16:12-14),[191] which somewhat surprisingly involved strongly grasping her son with her hand (Gen 21:18; cf. Is 35:3; diff. Gen 16:10-12).[192] The additional motif of opening one's eyes and seeing water in the wilderness (מדבר + מים + עין + פקח: Gen 21:19-20; cf. 21:14) was borrowed from Is 35:5-6.

The concluding account of Abraham's covenant with Abimelek, which highlights Abraham's possession and prosperity in the Promised Land (Gen 21:22-34), narratively illustrates the ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 11:8-25. The author of Genesis somewhat surprisingly presented the Gentiles Abimelek and Phicol as commonly acknowledging God-given strength of the Israelite Abraham (Gen 21:22-23; cf. Deut 11:8.23.25).[193] Besides, the author of Genesis depicted Abraham as possessing a well in the Gentile land (Gen 21:25; cf. 20:15; cf. Deut 11:8-11) and as driving out its earlier possessors in a peaceful way (Gen 21:26.30; diff. Deut 11:23). The aetiological story about the origin of the name of Abraham's possessed place (מקום) of Beer-sheba (Gen 21:28-33; diff. 21:14)[194] alludes to the Deuteronomic description of the Israelites' land as extending in the south to the wilderness (Deut 11:24; cf. Am 8:14). The particular way of calling Yahweh the Everlasting God (Gen 21:33) illustrates the idea of Yahweh's everlasting faithfulness to Israel (Deut 11:21; cf. 11:12). The subsequent image of Abraham as staying in that land many days (ימים רבים: Gen 21:34) originates from the image of the Israelites as having their days in the Promised Land multiplied (רבה + ימים: Deut 11:21; cf. 11:9).

---

191 Cf. ibid. 127-129. It should also be noted that Abraham is presented in Gen 21:14, in difference to Gen 16:6 (cf. also Deut 11:3-4), as dealing peacefully with the Egyptian Gentile.

192 The remark concerning Hagar as strongly grasping her son with her hand (Gen 21:18) is evidently important in the narrative logic of Gen 21:8-21 because it is prepared by the description of Abraham as putting the provisions on Hagar's shoulders (Gen 21:14), thus leaving her hands free: cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 84; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 196.

193 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 95; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 151. It should be noted that the idea of Abraham as making a covenant (ברית) with the Philistine Gentiles at Beer-sheba (Gen 21:27.32; cf. 21:23-24.31; cf. also 14:13; 26:28.34-35) stands in contradiction to the Deuteronomic order Deut 7:2. For this reason, it is reasonable to suppose that the Israelite author of Genesis once more wanted to present Judaea as the region in which such unorthodox dealings with the Gentiles take place (cf. also Josh 15:63; Judg 1:21).

194 Cf. J. Krašovec, *Transformation*, 16-17.

Accordingly, with the use of the idea of priestly intercession for sinful people, which was borrowed from Deut 9:8-10:11, the author of Genesis reworked the militant, and consequently politically dangerous, ideas of violently punishing the Gentiles and of dispossessing them (Deut 11:1-25) into a set of morally sensitive stories, in which the Israelite Abraham is presented as interceding for Gentile sinners and dealing peacefully with his Gentile neighbours (Gen 18-21).

2.12 The mountain of sacrificial worship and of testing the Israelites' love for Yahweh (Gen 22:1-19; cf. Deut 11:26-13:19)

The ideas of Yahweh's chosen mountain of sacrificial worship, in which sacrificing human sons is prohibited, and of testing the Israelites' love for Yahweh (Gen 22:1-19) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 11:29-13:19.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 22:1-19 and Deut 11:29-13:19 is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: נסה ('test' [loyalty]: Gen 22:1; Deut 13:4), בן ('son' [offered as a burnt sacrifice, testing absolute loyalty towards Yahweh]: Gen 22:2-3.6-10.12-13.16; Deut 12:31; 13:7), אהב ('love' [above all]: Gen 22:2; Deut 13:4), ארץ ('land' [at some distance, with its centre at Shechem]: Gen 22:2; Deut 11:29-31; 12:1.10.29), מריה\מרה ('Moriah/Moreh': Gen 22:2; cf. 2 Chr 3:1; Deut 11:30; cf. Judg 7:1; Gen 12:6), שׁם ('there' [location of the land of the sacred place]: Gen 22:2.9; Deut 11:29; 12:5-7.11.14.21), עלה ('burnt offering' [in the chosen place]: Gen 22:2-3.6-8.13; Deut 12:6.11.13-14.27), הר ('mountain' [of the sacred place]: Gen 22:2.14; Deut 11:29), עץ ('wood/tree' [of worship]: Gen 22:3.6-7.9; Deut 12:2), מקום ([Yahweh's chosen] 'place': Gen 22:3-4.9.14; Deut 12:5.11.14.18.21.26), ראה ('see' [the sacred place]: Gen 22:4; Deut 12:13), אשׁ ([sacrificial] 'fire': Gen 22:6-7; Deut 12:31), בוא ('come' [to the sacred place]: Gen 22:9; Deut 12:5-6.11.26), מזבח ('altar' [of Yahweh]: Gen 22:9; Deut 12:27), ירא ('fear' [God]: Gen 22:12; Deut 13:5.12), איל ('ram/deer' [allowed for eating]: Gen 22:13; Deut 12:15.22), שׁם ([Yahweh's] 'name': Gen 22:14; Deut 12:5.11.21), עשׂה דבר ('do a thing' [obeying Yahweh]: Gen 22:16; Deut 13:1), ברך ('bless' [in the sacred place]: Gen 22:17-18; Deut 12:7), and ירשׁ ('possess' [the land of the enemies]: Gen 22:17; Deut 11:29.31; 12:1-2.29).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 22:1-19 and Deut 11:29-13:19 is relatively easy to ascertain. The name מרה ('Moreh') in

Deut 11:30, as designating a sacred great tree near Shechem (cf. Gen 12:6; cf. also Judg 9:37), is evidently original against the name מריה ('Moriah' = 'Mori-Yah') in Gen 22:2, an artificial name which etymologically illustrates the thought that the name of Yahweh 'dwells within' his chosen place (Deut 12:5.11).[195]

Accordingly, the account of Abraham's travel to the mountain and place called Moriah, in which his son apparently had to be sacrificed for Yahweh (Gen 22:1-19), narratively illustrates the main ideas of the Deuteronomic text which refers to Yahweh's chosen mountain located beside the great tree of Moreh, Yahweh's sacred place in which sacrificing human sons is prohibited, and testing the Israelites' love for Yahweh (Deut 11:26-13:19).

In particular, the first sentences of the account (Gen 22:1-2a) introduce one of its dominant themes, namely that of testing Abraham's loyalty and love for Yahweh.[196] This theme was borrowed from the Deuteronomic text which deals with the possibility of God's testing the Israelites, to know whether they really love him with all their heart and with all their soul (Deut 13:4).[197] The particular task of the believers in such a case, namely that of not listening to anyone who could turn them away from Yahweh (Deut 13:4), going after Yahweh and obeying his voice (Deut 13:5), and putting the enticing person to death (Deut 13:6), even if this would refer to one's own son (Deut 13:7), was illustrated in Genesis by the account of Abraham listening to no one but Yahweh, obediently going according to his command, and resolving to put his much-beloved son to death (Gen 22:2-10).

It is reasonable to argue that the tragic motif of the father's attempt to kill his child as a sacrifice to God, which expressed his obedience to a divine oracle, which was intended to be performed with the use of a knife, which was eventually substituted with a bloody sacrifice of a wild animal, and which was re-

---

195 It should be noted that within the framework of Deuteronomy, and within that of Genesis, Yahweh's chosen place for all Israel is located near Shechem, in the territory of Ephraim (Deut 11:29; 27:12-13; cf. Josh 8:30-33; 24:1-27.32; Judg 9:37; Gen 12:6; 33:18-20; cf. also 1 Kgs 12:1). This fact again implies that Genesis, like Deuteronomy (cf. esp. Deut 33:7.13-17), is not a Judaean but an Israelite writing.

196 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 202.

197 Cf. G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 296-299, who suggests that Gen 22 alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibition to listen to false prophets and dreamers of dreams (Deut 13:1-5). However, Abraham's blind obedience to God is not presented in Gen 22 as resulting from any prophecies or dreams.

warded with a divine blessing (Gen 22:2-18), originates from Greek mythology and literature (cf. e.g. Euripides, *Iph. aul.* 1543-1601). This particular motif was evidently known in various versions in Greek mythology already before the fifth century BC.[198] In fact, its use in Gen 22:2-18 resembles other cases of literary use of Greek mythology in Genesis, namely in the accounts in which they allusively depict Gentile lack of proper faith and moral behaviour (cf. also Gen 19:17.26; 39:7-20). In order to illustrate the Deuteronomic idea that the ancient, Gentile, Canaanite worship was abhorrent because it involved killing the Canaanites' sons and daughters as sacrifices to their gods (Deut 12:31), the author of Genesis seems to have used in Gen 22:2-18 the modern for him, Gentile, Greek literary motif of Agamemnon killing his daughter Iphigenia as a sacrifice.[199]

This tragic-legendary motif was conflated in Gen 22:1-19 with that of the proper place and manner of the Israelites' worship of Yahweh (Deut 11:29-12:31). Because Genesis, like Deuteronomy, is an Israelite and not a Judaean writing, the allusive story Gen 22:1-19 is based on the Israelite reworking of Ezekiel's idea that Yahweh's chosen place of worship should be located in the centre of Canaan (Ezek 48:8-22) into the Deuteronomic idea that this place should be found in the region of Shechem, which was regarded by the Ephraimites as the 'navel of the land/earth' (Deut 11:29-12:31; 27:12-13; cf. Josh 8:30-33; 24:1-27.32; Judg 9:37; 1 Kgs 12:1; cf. also Gen 12:6; 33:18-20).[200] For this

---

198 Cf. D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (Routledge: London · New York 1991), 83-85; J. N. Bremmer, 'Sacrificing a Child in Ancient Greece: The Case of Iphigeneia', in E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (TBN 4; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2002), 21-43 (esp. 21-35).

199 *Pace* E. G. Dafni, *Genesis, Plato und Euripides: Drei Studien zum Austausch von griechischem und hebräischem Sprach- und Gedankengut in der Klassik und im Hellenismus* (BThSt 108; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010), 134 who uncritically suggests that Genesis in a provisional Greek translation was known to and used by Euripides (and Plato).

200 The identification of Yahweh's chosen place of Moriah/Moreh (Gen 22:2; cf. Deut 11:30; Judg 7:1; Gen 12:6.22) with Mount Zion in Jerusalem is attested only later, in the clearly Judaean text 2 Chr 3:1 (cf. also 2 Sam 6:1-19 etc.). Cf. Y. Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, trans. J. Chipman (BIS 25; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2000), 142-150; J. Blenkinsopp, 'Benjamin Traditions Read in the Early Persian Period', in O. Lipschits and M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*

reason, Abraham is described in Gen 21:33-22:4 (cf. 22:19) as needing three days for his hasty travel from Beer-sheba to the land of Moriah.[201]

The strange in itself description of Moriah as a 'land' within the land of Canaan (Gen 22:2) alludes to the Deuteronomic presentation of Canaan as the land which was seen by the Israelites from afar, from the territory of Moab (Deut 11:29-31; 12:1.10.29). The otherwise unknown name 'the Moriah' (Gen 22:2; cf. the later, ideology-laden text 2 Chr 3:1), which is an artificial combination of the names Moreh and Yahweh ('Mori-Yah'; cf. Gen 28:19: 'Beth-El'), in a linguistically creative way illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the name of Yahweh dwells within his chosen place which is located near the sacred great tree at Moreh (or 'the Moreh': Judg 7:1), in the region of Shechem (Deut 12:5.11; cf. Deut 11:30; Gen 12:6; cf. also Judg 9:37). Likewise, the vague description of Yahweh's chosen place as located 'there' (Gen 22:2.9) alludes to the similarly imprecise description of the location of the sacred place in Deut 12:5-7.11.14.21 (but cf. 11:29; cf. also 27:12).

The particular thought that burnt offerings (and not simply invoking Yahweh's name) should be offered to Yahweh only in his chosen place of Moriah, a thought which is narratively conveyed by the fact that except for Gen 22:2-13 there is no other reference in Genesis to offering burnt offerings,[202] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that in the whole land of Canaan there should be only one central sanctuary of Yahweh, in which burnt offerings should be offered (Deut 12:6.11.13-14.27; cf. also Josh 22:10-34).[203] The identification of this

---

(Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2006), 629-645 (esp. 631); B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 204, 208.

201 See K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 290-291. The semantically unclear phrase לֶךְ־לְךָ in Gen 22:2 evidently echoes the beginning of the story about Abraham (Gen 12:1), which in the context of Gen 11:30-32 highlights priestly features of the Moses-like character of Abraham (cf. Deut 33:9). It seems that the phrase לֶךְ־לְךָ in Gen 22:2 has the same allusive function, pointing to the priestly meaning of the whole account Gen 22:1-19.

202 Gen 8:20 does not contradict this rule because it is a 'prehistoric' and geographically imprecise text. Cf. T. C. Römer, 'Du Temple au Livre: L'idéologie de la centralisation dans l'historiographie deutéronomiste', in S. L. McKenzie, T. Römer, and H. H. Schmid (eds.), *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible*, Festschrift J. Van Seters (BZAW 294; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2000), 207-225 (esp. 217).

203 Cf. T. Veijola, 'Das Opfer des Abraham – Paradigma des Glaubens aus dem nachexilischen Zeitalter', *ZTK* 85 (1988) 129-164 (esp. 153).

place with one of the mountains (Gen 22:2.14) originates from Deut 11:29 and most probably illustrates the thought that Mount Gerizim was chosen by Yahweh from among the two mountains which are located near Shechem (Deut 11:29; cf. 27:12-13).[204]

The repeated reference to Moriah as a particular ‘place’ (Gen 22:3-4.9.14), which is somewhat surprising in the context of the descriptions of Moriah as a land (Gen 22:2) and a mountain (Gen 22:2.14), alludes to the repeated Deuteronomic references to the particular place in which proper worship of Yahweh should be conducted (Deut 12:5.11.14.18.21.26), in contrast to numerous places of the Canaanite cult (Deut 12:2-3.13). It is possible that the latter, negative reference to the Canaanite worship, in particular to the worship of sacred trees (Deut 12:2; cf. 16:21), was illustrated in Gen 22:3.6-7.9 with the use of the motif of wood which was split into pieces and burnt for the sacrifice (cf. Judg 6:26). Likewise, the description of Abraham as seeing Yahweh’s sacred place from afar (Gen 22:4) may negatively allude to the Deuteronomic idea of seeing various places of the Canaanite worship (Deut 12:13).

In any case, the description of the priestly, Moses-like character of Abraham as leaving his servants with the donkey at a distance from Yahweh’s sacred place (Gen 22:4-5.19) and as going there only with his son (Gen 22:5-6.9) has a clear liturgical meaning (cf. Exod 20:18-21; 24:1; Josh 3:4).[205] Similarly, the motif of eternal sacrificial fire in the hand of Abraham, which is rather strange in itself[206] and rather unnecessarily stressed in Gen 22:6-7, was borrowed from

---

204 It should be noted that the recently discovered copy of Deut 27:4-6 (0QDtn), made known in September 2009 by the Azusa Pacific University, has בהרגרזים and not בהר עיבל in Deut 27:4 (unlike MT; there is no Qumran witness for this fragment: 4QDtn^{f} has a lacuna there): cf. S. Kreuzer, ‘Vom Garizim zum Ebal: Erwägungen zur Geschichte und Textgeschichte sowie zu einem neuen Qumran-Text’, in U. Dahmen and J. Schnocks (eds.), *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit: Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität*, Festschrift H.-J. Fabry (BBB 159; V&R / Bonn University: Göttingen 2010), 31-42 (esp. 38-40); U. Schattner-Riesner, ‘Garizim *versus* Ebal: Ein neues Qumranfragment samaritanischer Tradition?’, *EChr* 1 (2010) 277-281. See also J. H. Charlesworth, ‘An Unknown Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy’ (Institute for Judaism and Christian Origins), updated Nov. 2009 <http://www.ijco.org/ ?categoryId=28682>, accessed 21 Sept. 2011. In any case, the author of Genesis evidently regarded a mountain near Shechem as the location of the unique legitimate postexilic sanctuary of Yahweh in Israel.

205 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 107; G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 280-282.

206 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 98 n. 7.

Deut 12:31 and reworked in such a way that it could illustrate the priestly features of the Moses-like character of Abraham (cf. Deut 5:22-27; Lev 1:7; 6:5). The motif of a small livestock beast (שֶׂה), normally offered as a sacrifice to Yahweh (Gen 22:7-8), was borrowed from Deut 17:1; 18:3 etc.

The particular question and the subsequent silence of Isaac in Gen 22:7-10 allude to the features of the sacrifice-like character of the servant of Yahweh (Is 53:7).[207] In this way, the author of Genesis suggested that the Israelite priests might be tested by Yahweh as concerns their observing Yahweh's word and keeping Yahweh's covenant (cf. Deut 33:8-9) up to the point of their readiness to offer themselves for the people.

The remark concerning Abraham as eventually coming from afar to Yahweh's chosen place (Gen 22:9; cf. 22:2-6) illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites coming from the whole land of Canaan to Yahweh's place of worship (Deut 11:29-12:1; 12:5-14.18.26-27). Likewise, the motif of building an altar in Yahweh's chosen place at Shechem (Gen 22:9; cf. 12:7; 33:20) originates from Deut 12:27 (cf. 27:5-6). The subsequent sacrificial actions of Abraham (Gen 22:9) have a clearly priestly character (cf. Lev 1:7-8).

The most dramatic scene of the account, namely that of Abraham trying to slaughter (שׁחט) his own son for a sacrifice to God,[208] an action which is interrupted by Yahweh's angel (Gen 22:10-12), narratively illustrates the prophetic-Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites are strictly forbidden from slaughtering their children for burnt sacrifices in idolatrous worship (Deut 12:31; cf. Is 57:5; Jer 7:31-32; 19:5; 32:35; Ezek 16:20-21; 20:26.31; 23:37.39; Deut 18:10; Judg 11:30-40).[209] In line with the ideas of Deut 13:4-12 the Israelites' absolute loyalty to Yahweh should be expressed in fearing him, obeying his voice, and loving him above all, which does not exclude, however, killing one's own son if the

---

207 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 152.

208 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 109; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 207 n. 221.

209 Cf. Y. Amit, *Hidden*, 66-70; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 202 n. 201. On the other hand, E. Noort, 'Genesis 22: Human Sacrifice and Theology in the Hebrew Bible', in E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar (eds.), *Sacrifice*, 1-20 (esp. 8) observes that Ezek 20:25-26 conveys the idea that in particular circumstances child sacrifice could be ordered by God himself. It should be noted, however, that Ezek 20:25-26 clearly states that offering children as burnt sacrifices was allowed by Yahweh as a punishment on Israel, but it was in fact abhorred by Yahweh, as it should be abhorred by the Israelites.

love for him contradicts the Israelite's love for Yahweh (Gen 22:12.16, cf. also Deut 21:18-21).[210]

The image of ram (or deer caught in a thicket by its antlers) which was offered in a sacrifice instead of Isaac (Gen 22:13; cf. 15:9) may allude both to the Greek legend that the sacrificed Iphigenia was divinely substituted with a deer (Euripides, *Iph. aul.* 1581-1595) and to the Deuteronomic thought that deer may be eaten by the Israelites without restrictions (Deut 12:15.22; cf. 14:5; 15:22). The somewhat enigmatic reference to the name of the sacred place as related to Yahweh's seeing (and being seen) on the sacred mountain to this day (Gen 22:14)[211] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites should see Yahweh (and should be seen by him) in his chosen place (מקום + יהוה + ראה: Deut 16:16; 31:11).[212] The clearly artificial, Yahwistic name of the chosen place, namely 'Yahweh sees' (Gen 22:14; diff. 22:8),[213] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh's name will dwell in his chosen place (Deut 12:5.11.21). In this way, the author of Genesis suggested that Mount Gerizim became the fulfilment of the sign of Horeb.[214]

The reference to Abraham's act of loyalty to Yahweh as his obedient 'doing this thing' (Gen 22:16) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should do everything which Yahweh commands them (Deut 13:1; cf. also 13:12.15). The description of the divine blessing which was bestowed by Yahweh in his sacred place (Gen 22:17-18) illustrates the main idea of Deut 12:7. The somewhat strange content of the blessing, namely the promise that Abraham's offspring will possess the gate of their enemies (Gen 22:17; cf. 24:60),[215] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will possess the land of Canaan, and consequently its cities with their gates, which now belong to the Canaanites (Deut 11:29-31; 12:1-2.29; cf. 12:12.15.17-18.21). The correlated

---

210 Cf. A. Flury-Schölch, *Segen*, 329-330.

211 Cf. J. Krašovec, *Transformation*, 18.

212 Cf. A. Marx, 'Sens et fonction de Gen. xxii 14', *VT* 51 (2001) 197-205 (esp. 204-205).

213 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 207.

214 It is significant that the probable time of the composition of Genesis (the second half of the fifth century BC: see e.g. Gen 10:1-11:9) coincided with the time of the construction of the Yahwistic sanctuary on Mount Gerizim: cf. Y. Magen, 'The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence', in O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2007), 157-211 (esp. 176-183); id., *Mount Gerizim*, vol. 2, 103, 152, 175.

215 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 2, 533.

motifs of Yahweh's swearing and of regarding his blessing as bestowed because Abraham obeyed Yahweh's voice (שׁבע + עקב + שׁמע: Gen 22:16.18; cf. 26:3.5) originate from Deut 7:12.

Accordingly, the dramatic account Gen 22:1-19 with the use of widely known legendary motifs illustrates the main, originally distinct ideas of Deut 11:26-13:19, in particular those of Yahweh's choosing the place of sacrificial worship on the mountain near Shechem, prohibition of offering children as burnt sacrifices, and testing the Israelite's readiness to put his son to death in case this son entices him to turn away from absolute loyalty to Yahweh.

2.13 Being a holy people, burial outside Canaan proper, Yahweh's gift of a new generation, and observing dietary taboos (Gen 22:20-28:9; cf. Deut 14:1-21)

The combination of the ideas of being a holy people, proper burial of the dead outside Canaan proper, Yahweh's gift of a new generation, and observing dietary taboos (Gen 22:20-28:9) structurally corresponds to a similar combination in Deut 14:1-21.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 22:20-28:9 and Deut 14:1-21 is provided by several common key words of both texts: מת ('dead person' [by the time of the burial]: Gen 23:3-4.6.8.11.13.15; Deut 14:1), בנים ('sons' [as a gift of Yahweh]: Gen 22:20; 25:22; Deut 14:1), עם ([foreign] 'people': Gen 26:10-11; Deut 14:2), אכל ('eat' [wild animals]: Gen 27:4.7.25.33; Deut 14:4.6-7; cf. 14:3.8-12.19-21), and גדי ('kid' [prepared in a special way]: Gen 27:9.16; Deut 14:21).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 22:20-28:9 and Deut 14:1-21 is not easy to ascertain. However, whereas the instruction Deut 14:1-2 suits its context, which describes Israel as a holy people (cf. esp. Deut 14:21), the account of the death and burial of Sarah (Gen 23) is only loosely connected with its narrative context.

Accordingly, the section Gen 22:20-28:9, with its main themes of being a holy people, burial outside Canaan proper, Yahweh's gift of a new generation, and observing dietary taboos, may be regarded as a result of a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:1-21.

In particular, the genealogical account Gen 22:20-24 with its description of Bethuel as the eight (i.e. additional: cf. 1 Sam 16:10-11) and, moreover, his mother Milcah's rather than his father Nahor's son (Gen 22:20-23; cf. 24:15.24; diff. 24:47), which conveys the idea that he was a gift of Yahweh and not a result of simply human begetting (cf. also Gen 21:1-2),[216] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites (and their close relatives) are children of God (Deut 14:1).[217] Moreover, this account, with its Deuteronomy-based (cf. Deut 26:5) presentation of the Aramaeans as having common ancestors with the Israelites (Gen 22:21; cf. 15:2), introduces the narrative thread of Abraham's Aramaean relatives living in Paddan-aram but nevertheless belonging to the same holy people, and consequently providing suitable (i.e. not Canaanite) wives for the Israelites Isaac and Jacob (cf. Gen 24:1-67; 25:20; 27:43-28:8; 29:1-32:1). This narrative thread in a folkloristic way illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites are a holy people, which has been chosen out of all the peoples on earth (Deut 14:2.21) and which is not allowed to take wives for their sons from the daughters of the Canaanites (לא + לקח + לבן + בת: Gen 24:3.37; cf. Deut 7:3).[218]

The subsequent account of the death and burial of Sarah (Gen 23) alludes to the subsequent idea of proper mourning for the Israelites' dead (Deut 14:1b; cf. esp. Gen 23:2-3a). However, the main motif of this account, namely that of buying a place for burial of the Moses-like character of Abraham and of his relatives in a cave in the land of the Hittites (Gen 23:3b-20; cf. 25:9-10;[219] 49:29-32; 50:13), alludes to the Deuteronomic presentation of Moses as having been buried in a valley in the land of Moab (Deut 34:5-6; cf. Gen 19:30: מערה in

---

216 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 148.

217 The same idea is also expressed through the intriguing narrative absence of Rebekah's father in Gen 24:28-49.53-61.

218 Cf. J. L. Ska, 'Essai sur la nature et la signification du cycle d'Abraham (Gn 11,27 – 25,11)', in A. Wénin (ed.), *Studies*, 153-177 (esp. 169-170) [also as id., 'Essay on the Nature and Meaning of the Abraham Cycle (Gen 11:29-25:11)', in id., *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions* (FAT 66; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2009), 23-45 (esp. 38)].

219 The particular description of Abraham's death, namely that of his being gathered to his people (עם: Gen 25:8; cf. also 25:17; 35:29; 49:29.33), a description which suggests that Abraham and his relatives ranked among God's 'eternal' people, also seems to illustrate the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites are a holy people (Deut 14:2.21).

Moab).[220] For this reason, the somewhat surprising reference to Abraham and Sarah's grave as located opposite (על־פני) Mamre, that is Hebron (Gen 23:19; cf. 25:9; 49:30; 50:13; cf. also 23:17),[221] most probably alludes to the location of Moses' grave as located opposite Jericho (Deut 34:1.6).

In the Deuteronomy-based, Israelite, narrative logic of Genesis, the Judaean region of Hebron lies outside Canaan proper (cf. Deut 33:7),[222] and it structurally corresponds to Transjordan in Deuteronomy.[223] Correspondingly, the Transjordanian territory of Moab, which was once Israelite but was later lost (cf. Mesha Inscription ll. 4-31), found its counterpart in Genesis in the Judaean (or Edomite), peripheral region of Hebron, which was likewise, from the Israelite point of view, once Israelite but later lost (cf. Deut 33:7).[224] For this reason, the unnamed valley near Mount Nebo in Moab (Deut 34:1.6), which was presented in Deuteronomy as the place of the burial of Moses (Deut 34:6), but also as the place which did not belong to Israel (cf. Deut 2:9) and in which the Israelites had to buy everything from the weaker Moabites for money (בכסף: cf. Deut 2:5-6.28-29), found its counterpart in Genesis in the valley cave of Machpelah near Hebron (Gen 23:9.17.19; 25:9 etc.; cf. 23:2; 37:14),[225] which was the place of the burial of Abraham with his relatives (Gen 23:19; 25:9; 49:29-31; 50:12-13),

---

220 On the third ('Abraham-biographic': Gen 12:1-25:10) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the death and burial of Sarah and Abraham (Gen 23:1-20; 25:7-10) structurally correspond to the death and burial of Moses (Deut 34:5-8).

221 Cf. J. Lemański, 'Grób jako znak prawa własności ziemi? Rdz 23 i jego przesłanie teologiczne', *RoczB* 1 (2009) 127-153 (esp. 149).

222 It should be noted that only the region of Shechem is regarded in Genesis as the hereditary possession (נחלה) of the (Josephite) sons of Israel (Gen 48:6; cf. Josh 24:30.32; Exod 15:17).

223 In difference to the perspective of Deuteronomy, Transjordan in Genesis no longer belongs to the territory of Israel (Gen 13:10-12; 32:10-11; 50:10-13). Consequently, the peripheral, Judaean region of Hebron fulfils in Genesis the rhetorical function of the peripheral, para-Israelite region of Transjordan in Deuteronomy.

224 In the Persian period, Hebron belonged to the territory of the Edomites (cf. Neh 11:25-30; 1 Macc 5:65). Cf. C. Levin, 'Abraham erwirbt seine Grablege (Genesis 23)', in R. Achenbach and M. Arneth (eds.), *»Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben« (Gen 18,19): Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie*, Festschrift E. Otto (BZAR 13; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 96-113 (esp. 113); F. Stavrakopoulou, *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestral Veneration in Biblical Land Claims* (LHBOTS 473; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 48.

225 For Ephron (עפרון: Gen 23:8 etc.) as the name of a mountain in Judaea, see Josh 15:9.

which belonged to the weaker Hittites (Gen 23:6.11), which could not be simply given by them (Gen 23:2-6.11), but which had to be legally bought from them for a very high (400 shekels) sum of money (Gen 23:9.13-18.20; 25:10; 49:30; 50:13).[226]

For this reason, the fact that the story about Abraham and Isaac is located, in terms of their permanent dwelling, in southern (Edomite) Judaea and in the Negeb (cf. e.g. Gen 13:18; 18:1; 20:1; 22:9; 23:2.19; 24:62; 25:11; 26:6.17),[227] and the story about Jacob is located, in terms of his permanent dwelling, in Israel (cf. e.g. Gen 33:18-19; 35:1), has to be explained not in source-critical terms,[228] but in Deuteronomy-based, intertextual-rhetorical terms of the succession between the old, Moses-like, peripheral generation of Abraham and the new, struggling (Joshua-like), Israel-based generation of Jacob.[229]

The account of the birth of Esau and Jacob (Gen 25:20-26), which presents the birth of Isaac's sons as an effect of his twenty-year-long pleading with Yahweh (Gen 25:20-21.26),[230] narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites are children of Yahweh (Deut 14:1). Moreover, it presents Jacob as a struggling figure (Gen 25:22-26), thus alluding, on the second ('successional':

---

226 Cf. Jer 32:9-10 (17 shekels); 2 Sam 24:24 (50 shekels) and 1 Chr 21:25 (deliberately exaggerating). According to the calculation made in Lev 27:16 Ephron's field had the price of a field which would require 8 homers (*c.*3.2 cu. m.) of seed for sowing it; by modern standards, it would have the area of *c.*13 ha (*c.*32 a.). Cf. also V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 135-136; C. Levin, 'Abraham', 113; J. Lemański, 'Grób', 147.

227 The additional remark concerning the Ishmaelites as dwelling in unwalled settlements (בחצרים) between Canaan and Egypt (Gen 25:16.18) alludes to Deut 2:23.

228 See E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984), 461-462; D. M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Westminster John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1996), 264-271, 291, 298-302.

229 In this hypertextual logic, the main character trait of God-given Isaac, who was born in the wilderness (Gen 17:19.21; 21:1-35:29), consists in being simply innocent (esp. Gen 22:9; 24:4.63.67; 27:26-40), which alludes to the innocent generation born in the wilderness (Deut 2:16).

230 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 385; L. Ngangura Manyanya, *La fraternité de Jacob et d'Esaü (Gn 25-36): Quel frère aîné pour Jacob ?* (ActR; Labor et fides: Genève 2009), 161-163; A. C. Hagedorn, 'Hausmann und Jäger (Gen 25,27-28): Aus den Jugendtagen Jakobs und Esaus', in A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition*, Festschrift M. Köckert (BZAW 400; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 137-157 (esp. 139).

Gen 12-50) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, to the fighting generation of the Israelites, with Joshua as its leader (Deut 1:38; 3:21.28; 31:3.7.23; Josh 1:1-9 etc.).[231] In particular, the somewhat surprising image of both boys being strong against each other (אמץ: Gen 25:23)[232] alludes to the image of both Sihon and Joshua being strong in the war (Deut 2:30; 3:28; 31:6-7.23). The thought that the Edomites are brothers of the Israelites (Gen 25:24-26 etc.) originates from Deut 2:4.8; 23:8.

The subsequent account of Jacob being more civilized (perfect) than Esau, and Esau eating a meagre meal (Gen 25:27.29-34; diff. 25:28),[233] is a result of a folkloristic-style conflation of the motifs of the Israelites being chosen by Yahweh (Deut 14:2b) and their not eating detestable things (Deut 14:3).

The particular features of the account of Isaac dwelling among the people (עם: Gen 26:10-11; diff. 12:19-20; 20:9.14-16) of Gerar, and of his being conspicuously fortunate, prosperous, and mighty there (Gen 26:1-33; esp. 26:3-4.12-14.16.19-22.24-25.28-32; diff. 12:20; 21:30),[234] illustrate the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites are chosen by Yahweh above all the peoples on earth (Deut 14:2). On the second ('successional': Gen 12-50) level of hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, this account, with its motifs of meeting an enemy king (מלך: Gen 26:1.8-11.16.26; cf. Deut 2:24-3:11), Yahweh giving Isaac enemy lands (ארץ pl.: Gen 26:3-4; cf. Deut 2:24-3:18), enemy people (עם: Gen 26:10-11; cf. Deut 2:25-3:3), having much livestock (מקנה: Gen 26:14; cf. Deut 3:19), dwelling by a river (נחל: Gen 26:17.19; cf. Deut 2:24-3:16), finding and not buying water (מים: Gen 26:18-20.32; cf. Deut 2:28), giving names to places up to this day (קרא + שׁם + עד היום הזה: Gen 26:18.20-22.33; cf. Deut 3:14), hostile quarreling with enemies (Gen 26:20-21; cf. Deut 2:24-3:18), being wide (רחב: Gen 26:22; cf. Deut 3:11), not fearing the enemies (אל־תירא: Gen 26:24; cf. Deut 3:2), meeting Ahuzzath (אחזת, i.e. 'possession': Gen 26:26; cf. Deut

---

231 The motif of Jacob gripping his brother's heel (or supplanting him) in his mother's womb (יעקב + עקב + אח + בטן: Gen 25:23-26; 27:36) originates from Hos 12:3-4.

232 Cf. L. Ngangura Manyanya, *Fraternité*, 165-166.

233 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 177-178; A. C. Hagedorn, 'Hausmann', 143.

234 Cf. E. Boase, 'Life in the Shadows: The Role and Function of Isaac in Genesis—Synchronic and Diachronic Readings', *VT* 51 (2001) 312-335 (esp. 324-329); D. Dieckmann, 'Gen 26 als Segenserzählung', *BZ*, NF 49 (2005) 264-274 (esp. 267-274); P. D. Vrolijk, *Jacob's Wealth: An Examination into the Nature and Role of Material Possessions in the Jacob-Cycle (Gen 25:19-35:29)* (VTSup 146; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011), 61-79.

32:49), and uttering a curse (Gen 26:28; cf. Deut 2:34; 3:6), is a pacific reworking of the description of the second generation of the Israelites, which conquered the enemy lands in Transjordan (Deut 2:24-3:20).

The concluding statements Gen 26:34-35 negatively allude to the thought that the Israelites are a holy people (Deut 14:2a), and consequently they should not intermarry with the Canaanites (Deut 7:3; cf. Gen 24:1-67; 25:20; 27:43-28:8; 29:1-32:1). The Israelite author of Genesis presented Esau in a bad light by describing him as having married a Judaean woman, who was a daughter of a Hittite (Gen 26:34-35; diff. 27:46-28:9).[235] In this way, the author of Genesis rhetorically related the Judaeans to the Canaanites (cf. also Josh 15:8.63; 18:16.28; Judg 1:21; 19:10-12).[236]

The account of Jacob obtaining the privilege of birthright in reward for a meal of a specially prepared kid (Gen 27:1-45; cf. 25:29-34) is a result of a folkloristic-style[237] conflation of the motifs of the Israelites being chosen by Yahweh (Deut 14:2b), preferring eating wild animals (Deut 14:4-5), and boiling kids in a special way (Deut 14:21).[238] In this way, the author of Genesis explained the

---

235 For a similar idea, see Gen 36:2.25 which presents Esau's wife Oholibamah as a Hivite and a Horite.

236 This fact again implies that the book of Genesis, like the book of Joshua and the book of Judges, is an Israelite and not a Judaean writing. Contrary to the widespread opinion, the books of Joshua and Judges display a more or less evident anti-Judaean bias, which is directed particularly against Jerusalem. According to Josh 15:8.63; 18:16.28; Judg 1:21; 19:10-12 Jerusalem is still a Jebusite (i.e. Gentile) city which, according to Judg 1:8, is not inhabited by the 'truly Israelite' sons of Judah. Cf. also G. T. K. Wong, 'Is There a Direct Pro-Judah Polemic in Judges?', *SJOT* 19 (2005) 84-110; M. Avioz, 'The Role and Significance of Jebus in Judges 19', *BZ*, NF 51 (2007) 249-256 (esp. 251, 256); T. C. Butler, *Judges* (WBC 8; Thomas Nelson: Nashville [et al.] 2009), lxxviii, 22, 26, 422.

237 Cf. M. J. Williams, *Deception in Genesis: An Investigation into the Morality of a Unique Biblical Phenomenon* (StBL 32; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2001), 196-197; J. Blenkinsopp, 'Biographical Patterns in Biblical Narrative: Folklore and Paradigm in the Jacob Story', in id., *Treasures Old and New: Essays in the Theology of the Pentateuch* (William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 2004), 137-154 (esp. 147-151).

238 On the third ('Isaac-biographic': Gen 21:1-35:29) level of sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, this account, with its surprising theme of blessing Jacob by Isaac before his death (לפני מותו + ברך: Gen 27:7.10; cf. 27:41; diff. 35:29), alludes to the blessing of the new generation of Israel/Jacob by the old Moses before his death (Deut 33; cf. 34:8). For this reason, the motif of Isaac's eyes being dim (כהה עין: Gen

Israelite religious obligation to observe quite irrational in themselves dietary taboos in widely understandable terms of an old man's preference for eating wild animals, which are specially prepared in a way which is well known to his able wife (esp. Gen 27:9-10).

The concluding motif of Jacob fleeing (ברח: Gen 27:43; cf. 35:1.7) to the tracks of Aram ('Paddan-Aram': Gen 28:2.5-7; cf. 31:18; 33:18; 35:9.26; 46:15; cf. also 25:20) originates from Hos 12:13.[239]

Accordingly, the long story about the burials of Sarah and Abraham, Isaac's endogamous and Esau's exogamous marriages, Isaac's prosperity among the people of Gerar, and Jacob's obtaining the birthright for particular meals (Gen 22:20-28:9) in a very creative, easily understandable, folkloristic way illustrates the particularly Israelite ideas of being a holy people, being chosen by Yahweh above all the peoples on earth, and observing dietary laws (Deut 14:1-21).

2.14 Meeting God in the place of giving a tithe (Gen 28:10-22; cf. Deut 14:22-29)

The idea of giving a tithe in the place which was chosen by God (Gen 28:10-22) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 14:22-29.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 28:10-22 and Deut 14:22-29 is provided by the key phrase עשׂר עשׂר ('give a tithe'), which is distinctive of both texts in the Bible (Gen 28:22; Deut 14:22), and by several common key words: מקום ([sacred] 'place': Gen 28:11.16-17.19; Deut 14:23-25), שׂים ('set' [a sign of

---

27:1) negatively alludes to the remark concerning Moses' eyes not being dim by the time of his blessing Israel (Deut 34:7). Likewise, the motif of Esau being hairy (שׂער: Gen 25:25; 27:11.23) alludes to the idea of Yahweh as having come from the Edomite Seir (שׂעיר: Deut 33:2; cf. 1:2; 2:4-5.8.12.22.29). The agricultural content of the blessing (טל + דגן ותירשׁ: Gen 27:28.37; diff. 27:39) alludes to Deut 33:28 (cf. also Hos 14:6-7).

239 On the third (now 'Jacob-biographic': Gen 25:26-50:13) level of sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, this motif of Jacob's escape from Canaan to the exile, which follows the account of Jacob's 'original sin' of dealing deceitfully with his father and his brother (Gen 27:18-36; cf. 25:26.29-34), alludes to the expulsion of Israel from Canaan to the wilderness in the aftermath of its 'original sin' of disbelief and making war in an unholy way (Deut 1:26-46). For this reason, it is possible that the earlier image of Jacob as deceiving his brother by cooking a stew (זיד: Gen 25:29) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of Israel as fighting against its enemy in a presumptuous way (זיד: Deut 1:44).

God’s presence]: Gen 28:11.18.22; Deut 14:24), ברך (‘bless’ [humans by Yahweh]: Gen 28:14; Deut 14:24.29), ירא (‘fear’ [Yahweh]: Gen 28:17; Deut 14:23), שׁער (‘gate’ [of the place of storing the tithe]: Gen 28:17; Deut 14:27-29), שׁם ([God’s] ‘name’: Gen 28:19; Deut 14:23-24), דרך (‘way’ [far from the sacred place]: Gen 28:20; Deut 14:24), and אכל (‘eat’ [from Yahweh’s providence]: Gen 28:20; Deut 14:23.26.29).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 28:10-22 and Deut 14:22-29 is quite easy to ascertain. The account of Jacob’s stay at Bethel and of his promise to regard this place as a sanctuary by giving a tithe to Yahweh in this place (Gen 28:10-22) evidently interrupts the story about his travel to Haran (Gen 27:41-29:4). In fact, this account illustrates the main idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:22-29, namely that of giving a tithe in the place which was chosen by Yahweh, which well suits its cultic context.

The account of Jacob meeting God’s angels at Bethel and of his speaking with God there (שׁם, מלאך, אלהים, בית־אל, עם: Gen 28:10-22), which follows the account of Jacob supplanting his brother (Gen 25:19-28:9), is thematically based on the prophetic text Hos 12:4-6. The author of Genesis evidently regarded this text as justifying the presence of Yahweh’s sanctuary at Bethel (Gen 28:10-22; cf. 12:8; 13:3-4; 31:13; 35:1-15),[240] and not only in the region of Shechem, where burnt sacrifices could legitimately be offered (Gen 22:1-19; cf. Deut 12:4-31).

The description of Bethel as the place which was chosen by Yahweh, and in which Jacob set a sign of Yahweh’s presence (Gen 28:11.16-19.22), alludes to

---

240 The motif of Israel’s old sanctuary at Bethel (and not, for example, in the capital city of Samaria) was repeatedly evoked in Genesis because of its importance in Israel’s preexilic writings (Hos 10:15; 12:3-5; Am 3:14; 4:1-4; 5:4-6; 7:10-13; cf. Jer 48:13; cf. also Josh 18:22; Judg 1:22; 1 Chr 7:28). However, in the postexilic period the sanctuary at Bethel lost its previous importance: cf. N. Na’aman, ‘Does Archaeology Really Deserve the Status of a “High Court” in Biblical Historical Research?’, in B. Becking and L. L. Grabbe (eds.), *Between Evidence and Ideology: Essays on the History of Ancient Israel read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap, Lincoln, July 2009* (OtSt 59; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011), 165-183 (esp. 176-182). It should be noted that in the Persian period Bethel seems to have belonged to the Israelite province of Samaria: cf. I. Finkelstein, ‘The Territorial Extent and Demography of Yehud/Judea in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods’, *RB* 117 (2010) 39-54 (esp. 43, 53).

Deut 14:23-26.[241] The author of Genesis reworked this Deuteronomic text with the use of the clearly legendary, and consequently easily understandable, story about Jacob using a stone as his bolster and later as a sacred pillar (Gen 28:11.18.22) and about the patriarch's night vision of a heavenly stairway[242] which touched the earth precisely at Bethel (Gen 28:11-13.16-19.22). The particular vision of a stairway (Gen 28:22) alludes to the famous ziggurat of Babylon (cf. Gen 11:1-9), a place which is subsequently alluded to by the statement concerning the 'gate of heaven' (Gen 22:17). By placing Yahweh on top of it (Gen 28:13), the author of Genesis conveyed the idea that the Israelite sanctuary of Yahweh prevailed over the famous sanctuary of the Babylonians.

The idea of Jacob as receiving a special blessing from Yahweh, a blessing which refers mainly to the land of Canaan[243] with its far-reaching borders and influence (Gen 28:13-15), narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as being blessed by Yahweh in the spacious Promised Land (Deut 14:24.29). This blessing also functions as a rhetorical device, which was well known in Middle Eastern (especially Assyrian) political ideology, to justify the transfer of paternal authority and power not to the firstborn son but to one of his younger siblings by means of a reference to a particular divine choice (cf. also Gen 25:19-28:9; 32:2-33:17).[244]

The somewhat surprisingly introduced description of Jacob's fear (Gen 28:16-17; diff. 28:13-15)[245] in a half-legendary way illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should learn to fear Yahweh in his chosen place (Deut 14:23). The artificially (i.e. not etymologically) added idea of Bethel as the gate of heaven (Gen 28:17) most probably, with the use of the Mesopotamian motif

---

241 Hence the somewhat surprising use of the phrase במקום ('in the place') in Gen 28:11 (cf. Deut 14:23; cf. also Gen 28:16).

242 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 252.

243 Cf. ibid. 253; P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 112.

244 Cf. M. M. de Jong, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (VTSup 117; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007), 251-270 referring to the rhetorical justification of Esarhaddon's rise to power against his elder brothers by means of prophetic oracles and favourable omens which expressed the will of gods for him, and by means of his own inscriptions which justified him against his rhetorically discredited brothers, similarly to the later justification of the appointment of his not-the-oldest son Ashurbanipal to the imperial throne.

245 Cf. U. Becker, 'Jakob in Bet-El und Sichem', in A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Erzväter*, 159-185 (esp. 164).

of Babylon as the 'gate of god',[246] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the gates of the city as the places of storing the sacred tithe (Deut 14:27-29). The strange description of Jacob as setting a sacred pillar (מצבה) in Bethel and pouring oil on the top (lit.: 'head') of it (יצק שמן על־ראש: Gen 28:18; cf. 28:22; 35:14; cf. also 31:13: משח), which contradicts the Deuteronomic rule Deut 16:22, narratively illustrates the idea of priesthood or, more precisely, of the high priest regarded as anointed by pouring oil on his head (cf. Exod 29:7; Lev 8:12; 21:10; cf. also 1 Sam 10:1; 2 Kgs 9:3.6).[247]

The explanation of the name Bethel as meaning 'the house of God' (Gen 28:17.19.22) is evidently etymological. However, the narratively superfluous remark concerning the previous name of that place (Gen 28:19; cf. Judg 1:23; cf. also 18:29)[248] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will choose a place in which he will cause his name to dwell (Deut 14:23-24; cf. also Jer 7:12). The artificial and probably topographically inaccurate reference to the previous name of the city (Luz: Gen 28:19; diff. Josh 16:2)[249] suggests to the reader that at a certain moment in history God resolved to put his name in that place, so that it became 'Beth-El', which means 'the house of God' (Gen 28:17.19.22; cf. 22:2: 'Mori-Yah').

The statement concerning Jacob as being kept by Yahweh in his way from Bethel and then back to Bethel from a place located far away from it (Gen 28:20-21) narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas concerning the Israelites as being blessed by Yahweh even far away from the sacred place (Deut 14:24) and as going to that place with a tithe (Deut 14:25). The reference to a particular sign of Yahweh's providence, namely to Yahweh's giving Jacob bread to eat (Gen 28:20; diff. 28:15),[250] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of eating the fruits of Yahweh's blessing both in the sanctuary and far away from it (Deut 14:23.26.29). The particular reference mainly to bread (Gen 28:20) corresponds to the Deuteronomic reference to grain as the most important fruit of Yahweh's blessing (Deut 14:23).

---

246 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 223; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 453 n. 207; U. Becker, 'Jakob', 166.

247 The idea of anointing a pious king, who should be subordinated to the Deuteronomic, theocratic law, is evidently secondary to that of anointing a high priest.

248 Cf. G. Galvagno, *Sulle vestigia di Giacobbe: Le riletture sacerdotali e post-sacerdotali dell'itinerario del patriarca* (AnBib 178; Gregorian & Biblical: Roma 2009), 167-168.

249 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 378.

250 Cf. P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 116.

The thought that Yahweh will be Jacob's God (Gen 28:21) originates from the motif of Yahweh as Israel's God (Deut 14:23-26.29 et al.). The concluding promise that in the sacred place Jacob will give a tithe of all that he will be given by Yahweh (Gen 28:22) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should give a tithe of every product of the Promised Land (Deut 14:22; cf. 14:23-29). By means of combining the motif of giving the tithe (Gen 28:22) with that of Jacob's hope for Yahweh's providential care of him (Gen 28:20-21; cf. 35:3),[251] the author of Genesis in an easily understandable way conveyed the Deuteronomic idea that the tithe should be regarded as an expression of the Israelites' thankfulness for Yahweh's blessing (Deut 14:26).[252]

Accordingly, the account of Jacob meeting God at Bethel and of his promise to regard this place as a sanctuary in which he should thankfully give a tithe to Yahweh (Gen 28:10-22) in an easily understandable way illustrates the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:22-29 with its idea of the Israelites' obligation to joyfully give a tithe in the place which was chosen by Yahweh.

2.15 Remission of debts in the seventh year, resulting in freedom from slavery and a departure gift of flocks (Gen 29:1-31:42; cf. Deut 15)

The motifs of the seventh year, remission of debts, freedom from slavery, a departure gift, and proper dealing with flocks (Gen 29:1-31:42) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 15.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 29:1-31:42 and Deut 15 is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: ארץ ('land' [of slave labour outside Canaan]: Gen 29:1; 31:13; Deut 15:15), בית ([the master's and one's own] 'household': Gen 29:13; 30:30; 31:14.37.41; Deut 15:16.20), אח ('kinsman' [under an obligation]: Gen 29:15; cf. 29:10.12; Deut 15:2-3.7.9.11-12), עבד ('serve' [one's kinsman]: Gen 29:15.18.20.25.27.30; 30:26.29; 31:6.41; Deut 15:12), שׁבע שׁנים ('seven years' [before the remission of obligations]: Gen 29:18.20.27.30; Deut 15:1; cf. 15:9), נתן ('give' [to the poor]: Gen 29:19.24.26-29; 30:26.28.31; Deut 15:9-10.14), שׁלח ('let go' [free]: Gen 30:25; 31:27.42; Deut 15:12-13.18), ברך ('bless' [by Yahweh's generosity]: Gen 30:27.30; Deut

251 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 256.

252 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 185.

15:4.6.10.14.18), בגלל ([blessing] 'because of': Gen 30:27; Deut 15:10), שׂכר ('wages' [of a hired labourer]: Gen 30:28.32-33; 31:8; cf. 29:15; 31:7.41; Deut 15:18),[253] צאן ('flock' [breeding, shorn, and taken as a departure gift]: Gen 30:32.38-41.43; 31:4.8.10.12.19.41; Deut 15:14.19), ילד ('bring forth' [young]: Gen 30:39; 31:8; Deut 15:19), רעע ('be evil' [against the poor brother]: Gen 31:7; Deut 15:9-10), יצא ('go out' [from the land of slavery]: Gen 31:13; Deut 15:16), נחלה ('inheritance': Gen 31:14; Deut 15:4), נכרי ('foreigner' [financially oppressed]: Gen 31:15; Deut 15:3), מכר ('sell' [someone for the price of a slave]: Gen 31:15; Deut 15:12), גזז ('shear' [flock]: Gen 31:19; Deut 15:19), השׁמר לך פן דבר ('be careful that you do not say' [evil]: Gen 31:24; cf. 31:29; Deut 15:9),[254] שׁשׁ שׁנים ('six years' [of serving one's kinsman]: Gen 31:41; Deut 15:12.18), ריקם ([let go] 'empty-handed': Gen 31:42; Deut 15:13), and עני ('poverty/poor': Gen 31:42; Deut 15:11).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 29:1-31:42 and Deut 15 is not easy to ascertain. However, the instruction Deut 15 suits its context, which refers to sacred periods of time (Deut 14:22-16:17), whereas the idea of Jacob as serving Laban precisely twice seven years and then six more years (Gen 29:18.20.27.30; 31:41) is in fact quite strange. For this reason, the account Gen 29:1-31:42 may be regarded as a narrative reworking of the instructions contained in Deut 15, with the use of well-known betrothal literary motifs, but not vice versa.

The story about Jacob's travel to the regions of Aram (ארם: Gen 31:18; cf. 28:2.5-7; 33:18; 35:9.26; 46:15; cf. also 25:20), about his serving (עבד: Gen 29:15.18.20.25.27.30; 30:26.29; 31:6.41) for his wife (אשׁה: Gen 29:21.28; 30:4.9.26; 31:17) by keeping flocks (שׁמר: Gen 30:31), and about his eventual fleeing from there (ברח: Gen 31:20-22.27) is thematically based on Hos 12:13. In Gen 29:1-31:42 these particular motifs illustrate the Deuteronomic ideas of the seventh year, remission of debts, freedom from slavery, a departure gift, and proper dealing with flocks, ideas which were borrowed from Deut 15.

The particular motif of the land of the people of the east, which is presented in Gen 29:1-31:42, in difference to Gen 24:10-61, as the land of Jacob's long-lasting labour (Gen 29:1; 31:13), functions as a counterpart of the motif of Egypt as the land of Israel's long-lasting slave labour (Deut 15:15). In Gen 29:1-14 this Deuteronomic motif was reworked with the use of the well-known folkloristic

---

253 Cf. G. Hepner, 'Jacob's Servitude with Laban Reflects Conflicts between Biblical Codes', *ZAW* 115 (2003) 185-209 (esp. 199-200).

254 Cf. ibid. 197.

motif of encountering the future bride by a well (cf. Gen 24:10-32).[255] The main difference between the stories of Gen 24:10-32 and Gen 29:1-14 consists in the fact that whereas in Gen 24:10-32 Abraham's servant came to Bethuel's house as an envoy of a wealthy man (cf. esp. Gen 24:22.30), in Gen 29:1-14 Jacob comes to Laban's house as an empty-handed fugitive.[256] Likewise, in Gen 24:10-32 it was Rebekah who drew water from the well for the foreigner (Gen 24:14.18-20; cf. 24:43-46), and in Gen 29:1-14 it is the foreigner Jacob who performs this hard task (Gen 29:10).[257] These narrative details concerning Jacob introduce the theme of a poor one among Hebrew kinsmen (Gen 29:15), which is the main theme of Deut 15, the Deuteronomic hypotext of the section Gen 29:1-31:42.

The recurrent motif of Jacob serving his kinsman Laban for a particular period of time (Gen 29:15.18.20.25.27.30; 30:26.29; 31:6.41) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that a Hebrew slave should serve his master for only six years (Deut 15:12). The related motif of Jacob receiving wages for his work in Laban's household (Gen 29:15; 30:28.32-33; 31:7-8.41)[258] is based on the Deuteronomic thought that such a servant's work is worth the double of the wages of a hired labourer (Deut 15:18).[259]

The names of Laban's two daughters (Gen 29:16) are evidently symbolic: Leah means 'cow', and Rachel means 'ewe'.[260] As such, they allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should consecrate to Yahweh the firstborn males of their bovine herds and of their ovine flocks (Deut 15:19). For this reason, Leah's firstborn son is the 'Transjordanian' Reuben (Gen 29:13; cf. Deut 33:6), who is related to the ancient Yahwistic sanctuary on Mount Nebo (cf. Mesha Inscription ll. 17-18),[261] and Rachel's firstborn son is the 'Israelite' Jo-

---

255 Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, 'Biographical', 151-152.

256 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 265-266; P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 132-133.

257 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 455.

258 Cf. P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 139-141.

259 Cf. G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 386-387.

260 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 235; S. B. Noegel, 'Drinking Feasts and Deceptive Feasts: Jacob and Laban's Double Talk', in id. (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (CDL: Bethesda, Md. 2000), 163-179 (esp. 164); K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 467.

261 Cf. J. M. Hutton, 'Southern, Northern and Transjordanian Perspectives', in F. Stavrakopoulou and J. Barton (eds.), *Religious Diversity*, 149-174 (esp. 166).

seph (Gen 30:24; Deut 33:13-17), who is related to the ideal sanctuary of Yahweh in the region of Shechem (cf. Deut 11:29-12:28).

The motif of Jacob serving seven years for each of his wives (Gen 29:18.20.27.30) originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic idea of seven years as the period of time before the remission of obligations (Deut 15:1.9) with the related idea of six years of service as the value of a Hebrew slave (Deut 15:12). The corresponding motif of Laban giving to Jacob not only his daughters but also his maids (Gen 29:19.24.26-29) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should give to their poor kinsmen in a generous way (Deut 15:9-10). In order to illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of not being stingy when the seventh year approaches (Deut 15:9-10), the author of Genesis described Laban as initially generous to his poor kinsman (Gen 29:19.24.28-29; cf. 31:2.5).

The allegedly customary restriction concerning not giving the younger daughter before the firstborn one (הבכירה: Gen 29:26) may in fact allude to the law concerning special respect for every firstborn one (הבכור) because of its being consecrated to Yahweh (Deut 15:19). In any case, the author of Genesis presented Rachel as effectively 'lent' to Jacob already before he would pay for her with his seven-year-long service (Gen 29:27-28), thus illustrating the Deuteronomic idea of generous lending to one's Israelite kinsman for seven years, before the debt will be remitted (Deut 15:2-3.7-11). However, in difference to the legislation of Deut 15:1-3 the author of Genesis described Jacob's debt as not remitted but repaid after another seven years of his service (Gen 29:27.30; 31:41). For this reason, the situation of Jacob in Laban's household illustrates both that of an indebted freeman (Deut 15:2-3.7-11) and that of a Hebrew slave in the household of his likewise Hebrew master (Deut 15:12.18).

The folkloristic-etymological account of giving birth to Jacob's sons (Gen 29:31-30:24) is thematically based on the Deuteronomic model (Deut 2:15-17), in which the older, sinful generation gives way to the younger, innocent one. Accordingly, the account Gen 29:31-30:24 effectively rejects Leah's 'southern' sons Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, and highlights the importance of Joseph as the firstborn son of Jacob's younger, beloved, but initially barren wife Rachel (Gen 30:22-24).[262] Joseph, like Isaac and Jacob (cf. Gen 11:30; 15:21), is described as being an object of God's special grace. In this way, the Israelite author of Genesis presented the tribe of Joseph, in line with the idea of Deut

---

262 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 473-474.

33:13-17, as the most beloved among all the tribes (here: ‘sons’) of Israel (cf. also Josh 24:30.32-33).

The image of Jacob as asking Laban to let him free to go to his land after twice seven years of service (Gen 30:25), an image which corresponds to the image of Jacob serving Laban in fact as a Hebrew slave (Gen 29:18.20.25.27.30; 30:26.29; 31:6.41), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that a Hebrew slave should be let go free in the seventh year, after six years of his service (Deut 15:12-13.18). The related image of Laban as being abundantly blessed by Yahweh because of poor Jacob’s work (עשׂה) in his household (Gen 30:27.30) illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites being greatly blessed by Yahweh in all their work because of their generosity towards their poor kinsmen (Deut 15:10.18).[263]

The idea of Laban as feeling obliged to give Jacob some wages for his service in Laban’s household (Gen 30:28.31), notwithstanding the earlier accord that Jacob’s fourteen-year-long service would be the price for his two wives (Gen 29:27; cf. 29:18), originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic idea that a Hebrew slave should be given a departure gift at the time of his being set free (Deut 15:14) with that of his work being worth the double of the wages of a hired labourer (Deut 15:18). Likewise, the idea of a new accord concerning receiving flocks as wages for another period of Jacob’s work in Laban’s household (Gen 30:32-33; cf. 31:8) is based on these two combined Deuteronomic ideas, especially on the idea of providing the freedman with animals from the flock after six years of his service (Deut 15:14).

The motif of a particular kind of sheep and goats which would be received by Jacob, namely those with mixed-colour coat of inferior quality: speckled, spotted, dark, striped, and dappled ones (Gen 30:32-33.35.39-40; 31:8.10.12; diff. Song 6:5-6), which were, on the other hand, physically strong (Gen 30:41-42), most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that only animals without serious defects, such as lameness or blindness, may be sacrificed to Yahweh (Deut 15:21). In fact, there is a great difference between sheep and goats which are speckled, spotted, etc. (Gen 30:32-33.35.39-40; 31:8.10.12) and those which are lame or blind (Deut 15:21). Accordingly, the author of Genesis suggested that the animal sacrifice which was offered by Jacob on his way to Canaan (Gen 31:54) could be made of suitable animals (Deut 15:21).

---

263 Cf. G. Hepner, ‘Jacob’s Servitude’, 201-202.

The image of Laban as starting to deal with Jacob in a stingy, evil, and dishonest way (Gen 30:35-36; 31:2.5.7-8.12.15.22-23.39.41-42) negatively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not be stingy and evil towards their poor kinsmen when the seventh year approaches (Deut 15:9-10.18). Jacob's cunning 'genetic engineering' (Gen 30:37-42)[264] is narratively presented as a mere response and God-inspired self-defence of the oppressed hired labourer (cf. Gen 30:43; 31:3-21; cf. also 31:26-42).

The idea of newly-born flocks as God-given wages for Jacob's service (Gen 31:7-8) originates from a conflation of the idea of wages of a hired labourer (Deut 15:18) with that of consecrating to Yahweh the firstlings born of the Israelites' flocks (Deut 15:19). In this way, the author of Genesis narratively prepared the reader for the thought that having crossed Euphrates and having come to Gilead, that is to the 'place' (מקום: Gen 30:25) and land of Canaan (Gen 31:21; cf. Deut 1:7; 2:36; 3:10-16; 34:1), Jacob could offer as a sacrifice to Yahweh the firstlings which were born of his flocks during his stay in Laban's household (Gen 31:54), and in such a way the rule expressed in Deut 15:19-21 could be observed.

The combined ideas concerning Jacob as going out of the land of slave labour (Gen 31:13) and as going out of Laban's household (Gen 31:14) illustrate the Deuteronomic idea that a Hebrew slave going out of the master's household (Deut 15:16) resembles Israel going out of Egypt (Deut 15:15). The related ideas concerning Rachel and Leah as not having inheritance in Laban's household (Gen 31:14) and as being regarded as foreigners there (Gen 31:15)[265] negatively illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' unfavourable treatment of foreigners (Deut 15:3) in the land of their inheritance (Deut 15:4). Likewise, the idea of Laban as selling Rachel and Leah to Jacob (Gen 31:15) for the price of Jacob's twice-seven-year-long service to his kinsman (cf. Gen 29:18.20.27.30; 31:41) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that a Hebrew woman may be sold to her kinsman for the price of six years of service to him (Deut 15:12; cf. 15:18).

The somewhat surprisingly introduced motif of Laban shearing his flocks (Gen 31:19) negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the firstlings of flocks should not be shorn (Deut 15:19). In this way, the author of Genesis sug-

---

264 Cf. S.-M. S. Park, 'Transformation and Demarcation of Jacob's "Flocks" in Genesis 30:25-43: Identity, Election, and the Role of the Divine', *CBQ* 72 (2010) 667-677 (esp. 670); P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 174-179.

265 Cf. P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 192-194.

gested that thanks to God's providence Jacob took with himself all newly born animals from Laban's flocks (cf. Gen 31:8-12).

The image of Laban as pursuing Jacob (Gen 31:23), which is narratively justified by that of Rachel as having stolen Laban's household gods (Gen 31:19; cf. 31:30.32.34-35), as well as that of Jacob as having 'stolen' Laban's heart[266] and having fled like an enemy or a thief (Gen 31:20-22; cf. 31:26-28.31.36-37), negatively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not have difficulties with sending their slaves as free persons after six years of service (Deut 15:18). The related image of God saying to Laban, 'Be careful that you do not say' to Jacob anything evil (Gen 31:24.29)[267] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should be careful that in their hearts they do not entertain an evil word concerning the approaching seventh year and the obligation to remit the debts of their kinsmen (Deut 15:9).[268] On the other hand, Laban's declaration that he would have sent Jacob away with joy (Gen 31:27) illustrates the Israelite's proper behaviour of unreluctantly letting his Hebrew slave go free after six years of service (Deut 15:12-15.18).[269]

The ideas that Laban longed for his grandsons (lit.: 'sons') and daughters (בנים + בנות: Gen 31:28; cf. 31:30) and that it was in Laban's power (לאל יד) to do harm to Jacob (Gen 31:29) negatively allude to the Deuteronomic ideas that the divinely punished Israelites longed for their exiled sons and daughters, and that it was not in their power to do anything (Deut 28:32). The related idea of Jacob as being afraid that Laban would take his daughters from him by force (גזל: Gen 31:31) alludes to the likewise related Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites' property being violently taken away from them (Deut 28:28.31). Similarly, the mocking image of Laban as groping (משש) for his household gods (Gen 31:34.37)[270] alludes to the Deuteronomic image of the sinful Israelites as groping at noon like blind people (Deut 28:29). The mocking image of Laban as being misled by 'the way (דרך) of women' (Gen 31:35)[271] likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as not being successful in their ways (Deut

---

266 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 296; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 508, 517; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 274.

267 Cf. P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 198.

268 Cf. G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 388.

269 Cf. id., 'Jacob's Servitude', 203.

270 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 526.

271 It should be noted that this expression in itself does not naturally refer to menstruation: cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 275.

28:29). Consequently, in Gen 31:28-37 the author of Genesis presented the idolatrous Laban (Gen 31:19.29-30.32.34-35)[272] in Deuteronomic terms as someone who was punished by Yahweh for not observing Yahweh's commandments (cf. Deut 28:15).

The concluding calculation of the time of Jacob's service in Laban's household as amounting to twice seven years and then six more years (Gen 31:41; cf. 29:18.20.27.30) once again illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelite slave as serving in the household of his kinsman for six years, until the seventh year, which is the year of remission (Deut 15:12.18; cf. 15:16). The related ideas that Jacob served for the flocks and that he did not receive fair wages of a hired labourer (Gen 31:41) allude to the Deuteronomic idea that a departure gift from the master's flocks is a way of recompensing the slave for the value of his six-year-long work, as compared with the wages of a hired labourer (Deut 15:14.18). The reproach concerning Laban's being stingy and evil towards Jacob, which consisted in Laban's attempt to send the poor Jacob away empty-handed (Gen 31:41-42), illustrates the related Deuteronomic ideas of helping poor kinsmen (Deut 15:11) and of not sending the Hebrew freedman away empty-handed (Deut 15:12-13.18).

Accordingly, the account Gen 29:1-31:42 in an easily understandable, adventurous way, with the use of traditional betrothal motifs, narratively illustrates the particularly Israelite financial and cultic instructions which are contained in Deut 15, as well as the motif of covenantal curses for not observing Yahweh's commandments, which is contained in Deut 28:15-68.

2.16 Settling a legal dispute in a priestly realm (Gen 31:43-54; cf. Deut 16-19)

The motifs of a sacred pillar, just judging, and animal sacrifice (Gen 31:43-54) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 16-19.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 31:43-54 and Deut 16:1-17:1. It is provided by several common key words of both texts: מצבה ('sacred pillar' [set up]: Gen 31:45.51-52; Deut 16:22), שׁפט ([just] 'judge': Gen 31:53; Deut 16:18), and זבח ([acceptably] 'sacrifice': Gen 31:54; Deut 16:2.4-6; 17:1; cf. 15:21).

---

272 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 526.

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 31:43-54 and Deut 16:1-17:1 is not easy to ascertain. The prohibition of setting up a sacred pillar (Deut 16:22) seems not to have been taken into consideration in Gen 31:45.51-52. Moreover, it was not taken into consideration in Exod 24:4 either, notwithstanding the earlier command Exod 23:24. For this reason, it may be assumed that the author(s) of Gen 28:18.22; 31:13.45.51-52; 35:14.20 and Exod 24:4 differentiated between pagan sacred pillars (Deut 7:5; 12:3; 16:22 etc.) and memorial pillars which were set up by faithful Yahwists (Gen 31:45.51-52 etc.).

Accordingly, the story about Laban's covenant with Jacob (Gen 31:43-54) may be regarded as a narrative reworking of the Deuteronomic instructions concerning animal sacrifices, just judging, and sacred pillars (Deut 16:1-17:1). However, a detailed intertextual analysis of this story reveals that it narratively illustrates numerous ideas which are contained in the larger section Deut 16-19.

In particular, Laban's initial statement concerning his possession of his daughters, grandchildren, flocks, and other things taken by Jacob (Gen 31:43) is evidently false because Jacob paid for them with his twenty-year-long service in Laban's household (Gen 31:41).[273] For this reason, the ideas of Laban as bringing an unfounded charge (ענה) against Jacob and as strangely asking what he could do to his relatives (עשׂה ל: Gen 31:43) illustrate the legal case of a false accusation against another man (Deut 19:16.18), which is regarded as an attempt to do harm to one's brother (Deut 19:19).

The somewhat surprisingly used motif of a witness (עד) in the dispute between Laban and Jacob (Gen 31:44.48.50.52) originates from the Deuteronomic rules concerning the necessity of calling witnesses in a legal dispute between two men (Deut 17:6-7; 19:15-16.18).

The description of Jacob as setting up a sacred pillar (Gen 31:45; cf. 31:51-52) evidently contradicts the Deuteronomic rule expressed in Deut 16:22. However, the earlier, narratively redundant remark concerning the anointed sacred pillar at Bethel (Gen 31:13) recalled the motif of priesthood, imaginatively evoked by means of the image of pouring oil on the 'head' of the erected stone in God's house (Gen 28:18.22; cf. 35:14; cf. also Exod 29:7; Lev 8:12; 21:10). Consequently, the sacred pillar described in Gen 31:45.51-52 was not regarded by the author of Genesis as an idolatrous sacred pillar (cf. Deut 7:5; 12:3; 16:22

---

273 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 313.

etc.), but as a memorial-symbolic pillar set up by faithful Yahwists (cf. also Exod 24:4), which evoked the idea of Yahwistic priesthood.[274]

The likewise strange image of a heap of stones (Gen 31:46.48.51-52), which is related to the idea of priesthood (Gen 31:45.51-52), most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the temple erected on a mountain (Deut 11:29-12:28). For this reason, the surprising description of Jacob and his relatives as eating (אכל) on this heap (Gen 31:46.54)[275] alludes to the idea of eating sacrifices in the realm of the temple (Deut 16:7; 18:1.8). Consequently, the combination of the motifs of a sacred pillar and of a heap of stones (Gen 31:45-46.51-52; cf. 31:48) narratively illustrates the idea of Levitical priests acting in the temple. As such, this combination alludes to the Deuteronomic texts Deut 17:8-13; 19:16-20 (cf. also 17:2-7.18-20), which state that serious legal disputes, especially those concerning transgressions of the covenant (ברית: Deut 17:2), should be brought before Yahweh and before the priests who serve in the temple. The author of Genesis illustrated this Israelite idea by means of the easily understandable, traditional-religious image of Laban and Jacob as making a covenant, erecting a pillar, making a heap of stones, and invoking the name of God, actions which are presented as means to settle a moral-legal controversy (Gen 31:44-52). Additionally, in order to narratively enrich this image, the author of Genesis supplemented it with the etymological motif of explaining the names Gilead (Gen 31:47-48) and Mizpah (Gen 31:49; cf. צפה referring to a priest in Ezek 3:17; 33:7).[276]

Laban's warning concerning the possibility that Jacob could oppress Laban's daughters and take wives (נשים) in addition to Laban's daughters (Gen 31:50; cf. 28:9; diff. 30:4.9) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic rule concerning the king, who should not acquire much power and many wives (Deut 17:16-17; cf. 17:20).

The somewhat strange reference to Laban as 'throwing' (ירה) the heap and the pillar (Gen 31:51)[277] in fact illustrates the idea of the priests as instructing (ירה) the disputing Israelites in the temple (Deut 17:10-11; cf. 17:18-20). Conse-

---

274 It should be noted that there was no Levitical priesthood in the narrated time of Genesis (diff. Deut 17:9.18 etc.).

275 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, vol. 3, *Gen 25,19 – 36,43* (FzB 105; Echter: Würzburg 2005), 321.

276 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 313; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 533-534; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 276.

277 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 402.

quently, it is possible that the idea of the pillar as a witness (עדה: Gen 31:52) also alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the law regarded as Yahweh's witness (Deut 4:45; 6:17.20; cf. 31:26). Similarly, the image of passing (עבר) for evil beyond the heap and beyond the pillar of Laban and Jacob's covenant (Gen 31:52; cf. ברית in 31:44) seems to allude to the idea of transgressing Yahweh's covenant (Deut 17:2), and possibly also to the law concerning not displacing the neighbour's boundary mark (Deut 19:14).

The idea of God as judging between two disputing men (Gen 31:53) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of judges as representing Yahweh in settling legal disputes (Deut 19:17-18; cf. 16:18; 17:9.12). The related idea of Jacob as swearing (שׁבע) by the fear of his father Isaac (Gen 31:53; cf. 31:42) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of swearing by Yahweh's name (Deut 6:13; 10:20; cf. Is 2:10.19.21).

The concluding image of Jacob as offering a sacrifice on the mountain (הר), as well as eating bread (אכל לחם) and staying there together with his relatives overnight until early in the morning (בבקר: Gen 31:54-32:2), alludes to the Deuteronomic regulations concerning offering Passover sacrifices in Yahweh's temple (Deut 16:2.4-6; cf. 15:21; 17:1) which should be located on a mountain (Deut 11:29-12:28), and eating them together with the whole household (Deut 15:20; 16:7; cf. 18:1.8) with unleavened bread in the night of the Passover (Deut 16:6-7), regarded as the feast which commemorates Israel's going out of the land of slavery (Deut 16:3; cf. 16:8).

Accordingly, in Gen 31:43-54 the author of Genesis narratively illustrated several cultic and legal regulations which are contained in the large section Deut 16-19. He made it in an easily understandable way, by means of using traditional-religious motifs related to celebrating a conciliatory covenant between two disputing parties.

2.17 The aid of Yahweh and the name of Israel in an encounter with Israel's enemy (Gen 32:1-33:17; cf. Deut 20:1-9)

The motifs of the importance of the aid of Yahweh and of the name of Israel in an encounter with Israel's enemy (Gen 32:1-33:17) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 20:1-9.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 32:1-33:17 and Deut 20:1-9 is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: ירא ('be afraid' [of the enemy]: Gen 32:8.12; Deut 20:1.3.8), עם ([armed] 'people': Gen 32:8; 33:15; Deut 20:1-2.5.8-9), ראה ('see' [enemies]: Gen 32:21; 33:1.10; cf. also 32:31; Deut 20:1), לקח אשה ('take a wife': Gen 32:23; Deut 20:7), ישׂראל ('Israel' [as an identification before the battle]: Gen 32:29.33; Deut 20:3), נגשׁ ('approach' [the armed people]: Gen 33:3.6-7; Deut 20:2), רב ('numerous': Gen 33:9; cf. 32:13; Deut 20:1), רך ('weak' [approaching the enemy]: Gen 33:13; Deut 20:8), and בנה בית ('build a house' [not immediately before the battle]: Gen 33:17; Deut 20:5).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 32:1-33:17 and Deut 20:1-9 is relatively easy to ascertain. The idea of building a house only after going to war (Gen 33:17) may be regarded as a narrative illustration of the instruction Deut 20:5, but not vice versa.

Accordingly, the account of Jacob's spiritual preparations before the encounter with his vengeful brother Esau, which included receiving from Yahweh the powerful name Israel (Gen 32:1-33:17), is a reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 20:1-9, which refers to Israel as fighting a war without fear, because of being assured of Yahweh's aid.

In particular, the somewhat surprisingly introduced motif of God's angels meeting Jacob, which caused Jacob's regarding that place as 'God's (military) camp' or 'two camps' (מחנים: Gen 32:2-3; cf. 32:8-9.11.22; 33:8),[278] introduces the motif of Israel's war against its enemies, which was borrowed from Deut 20:1 (cf. 2:14-15; 23:10-15; 29:10). In this way, the author of Genesis presented Jacob as having been assured of God's aid already before his encounter with his vengeful brother Esau (cf. Gen 27:41).

The related motif of sending messengers (שׁלח מלאכים) of peace to Jacob's enemy (Gen 32:4; cf. 32:7) was borrowed from the Deuteronomic text Deut 2:26 (cf. also 20:10), which belongs to the account of Israel's conquest of the territory of Heshbon (Deut 2:24-37). On the other hand, the redundantly introduced motif of Jacob's movement to his brother Esau and towards Seir, that is Edom (Gen 32:4; cf. 33:14), alludes to Deut 2:4, which belongs to the account of Israel's peaceful dealing with the descendants of Esau (Deut 2:4-7). The author of Genesis evidently conflated these two Deuteronomic accounts in his story about

278 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 538.

the initially hostile but eventually peaceful meeting of Jacob with his brother Esau (Gen 32:2-33:17).

It may therefore be observed that the author of Genesis described Jacob's re-entry to Canaan after his long stay in the exile (Gen 32:2ff), which was caused by his 'original sin' of dealing deceitfully with his father and his brother (Gen 25:26; 27:18-36), in terms of Israel's re-entry to the Promised Land after its long stay in the wilderness (Deut 2:1ff), which was caused by its 'original sin' of disbelief and making war in an unholy way (Deut 1:26-46). Accordingly, the whole story about Jacob, from his birth, sin, and expulsion from Canaan up to his death and burial (Gen 25:26-50:13), may be regarded as a hypertextual reworking (on the third, 'biographic' level) of the Deuteronomic story about Israel, from its 'creation', sin, and expulsion from Canaan up to the death and burial of Moses (Deut 1-34).

The reference to Esau as coming to meet Jacob with four hundred men (Gen 32:7; 33:1) alludes to the Deuteronomic text Deut 20:1, which refers to the situation in which Israel's enemies are more numerous than the Israelites. The fearful reaction of Jacob (Gen 32:8.12) likewise illustrates a purely natural reaction of the Israelites in such a case (Deut 20:8; cf. 20:1.3). The presentation of Jacob's household as forming people divided into camps (Gen 32:8-9; cf. 32:11; 33:1) alludes to the Deuteronomic instructions concerning the Israelite troops as being prepared for a holy war outside Canaan (Deut 20:2.5.8-9). The particular thought that the enemies will possibly defeat (נכה) one of Jacob's camps but leave (שׁאר) the other (Gen 32:9), especially mother with children (אם על־בנים: Gen 32:12; cf. Hos 10:14; cf. also Deut 22:6), alludes to the regulations concerning the holy war in Transjordan, in which generally no survivor, including the women and the children, should have been left (Deut 2:33-34; 3:3.6; diff. 20:13-14). In this way, the author of Genesis presented the Israelites in Transjordan as being divinely protected from complete destruction (cf. Deut 33:6).

The description of Jacob as invoking Yahweh's name and Yahweh's promise that he will deal well with (עמך) him, before Jacob's encounter with his enemy (Gen 32:10.13), alludes to the thematically related exhortations concerning Yahweh as being with the Israelites (Deut 20:1.4; cf. 2:7). Jacob's complicated preparations of gifts for his brother (Gen 32:14-21) illustrate the Deuteronomic regulations concerning initially peaceful ways of approaching Israel's enemies (Deut 2:26; 20:10; diff. 2:24-25; 20:1-4). In this way, the author of Genesis conveyed the Deuteronomic idea that Israel should try to avoid conflicts with its neighbours, even if the price of peace would be very high (Deut 2:6.28).

The motif of crossing the River Jabbok (יבק + הנחל), a river which is somewhat surprisingly presented in Genesis as a border with the enemy territory (Gen 32:23-24), was borrowed from the Deuteronomic text Deut 3:16 (cf. 2:37), which refers to the River Jabbok as the border between the 'neutral' territory of the Ammonites and the territory which was conquered by the Israelites.

The motif of Jacob powerfully striving against God's angel (or God himself) and eventually prevailing despite suffering (שׂרה + אלהים + יכל: Gen 32:29; cf. 32:26), which functions as the key motif of the semi-mythological account of Jacob wrestling with God in order to get God's blessing before the encounter with Jacob's enemy (Gen 32:25-33),[279] was borrowed from Hos 12:4-5 in order to illustrate the Deuteronomic ideas of Yahweh's help in Israel's encounter with its enemy (Deut 20:1.4) and of the Israelites' courage and their not returning home while facing the battle (Deut 20:3.5-8). The related idea of changing the name of Jacob to that of Israel (Gen 32:28-29; cf. 35:10), which is based on the traditional identification of Jacob and Israel (cf. esp. Is 44:5; 48:1), alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of exhorting Israel to listen to God's word, especially before an encounter with Israel's enemies (Deut 20:3). The motif of seeing God face to face (פנים אל־פנים: Gen 32:31) was borrowed from Deut 34:10, thus assimilating Israel's patriarch Jacob to its great leader Moses.[280]

The description of Jacob as seeing that his vengeful brother Esau really came to him with four hundred men (Gen 33:1; cf. 33:9-10.15) illustrates the idea of the Israelites as seeing that their enemies are more powerful than the Israelites (Deut 20:1). Jacob's tactic of protecting mainly Joseph (Gen 33:2; cf. 33:7)[281] reflects the Deuteronomy-based conviction of the author of Genesis that Joseph is the most beloved among all the tribes of Israel (cf. Deut 33:13-17; cf. also Gen 30:22-24).

The surprising description of Jacob's brother Esau (אח: Gen 33:3.9) as dealing peacefully with Jacob (Gen 33:4-12.15)[282] alludes to the Deuteronomic

---

279 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 283-284.

280 Most probably for this reason, much priestly vocabulary was used in Gen 32:14.19.21-22.30-31; 33:3.6-7.10-11.17 (מנחה, כפר, ברך, etc.). For an earlier example of the use of such vocabulary in the hypertextual reworking of Deut 2:4-8 in Genesis, see Gen 4:3-5.

281 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 345; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 566, 569; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 288.

282 Cf. M. G. Brett, *Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity* (OTR; Routledge: London · New York 2000), 100; A. Agyenta, 'When Reconciliation Means More than the "Re-Membering" of Former Enemies: The Problem of the Conclusion to the Jacob-

thought that the descendants of Esau are the Israelites' brothers, and consequently both peoples should deal with each other in a respectful and peaceful way (Deut 2:4-8). In particular, the description of Jacob's clearly exaggerated gift to his brother Esau (Gen 33:8-11)[283] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites had to buy everything (even water for drinking) from the descendants of Esau for money (Deut 2:6). The secondary motifs of Jacob's weeping (בכה: Gen 33:4) and of God's favouring him (חנן: Gen 33:5.11) were most probably borrowed from Hos 12:5. In this way, by means of conflating the militant ideas of Deut 20:1-9 with the pacific ones of Deut 2:4-8, the author of Genesis presented Israel's conflict with its neighbour as possible to solve in a peaceful way.

The somewhat strange description of Jacob as excusing himself from Esau's company by saying that he had weak children and animals (Gen 33:13-14)[284] probably alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that someone who was tender should not approach the enemy (Deut 20:8). Likewise, the strange description of Jacob as building himself a house (and not a tent)[285] only after the potentially dangerous encounter with his enemy (Gen 33:17) narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic instruction concerning not allowing anyone who has recently built a house to approach the enemy (Deut 20:5). On the other hand, the location of Jacob's new house at Succoth, east of the Jordan (Gen 33:17), alludes to the Deuteronomic account of the Israelites' conquest of Transjordan (Deut 2:24-3:17; cf. Josh 13:27) and to the celebration of the festival of booths (Succoth) at the end of the period of seven years, in the year of remission (Deut 31:10).[286]

Accordingly, in Gen 32:1-33:17 the author of Genesis conflated the militant ideas of Deut 20:1-9 with the more pacific ones of Deut 2:4-8.26, and he illustrated them with the use of the traditional motif of an encounter of two estranged

---

Esau Story from a Narrative Perspective (Gen 33,1-17)', *ETL* 83 (2007) 123-133 (esp. 127-131); L. Ngangura Manyanya, 'Jacob a gagné toute la bénédiction, Ésaü n'a rien perdu: Respect et séparation, un autre modèle de fraternité (Gn 33, 1-17)', *ETR* 85 (2010) 479-498 (esp. 488-490).

283 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 282, 289.

284 Cf. A. Agyenta, 'Reconciliation', 124, 128-129; L. Ngangura Manyanya, 'Jacob', 491-492; I.-S. Chung, *A Revisionist Reading of the Esau-Jacob Stories in Genesis 25-36: Understanding Esau in a Positive Light* (Edwin Mellen: Lewinston · Queenston · Lampeter 2011), 216-218.

285 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 3, 402; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 291.

286 Cf. G. Hepner, *Legal Friction*, 353-354, 382.

brothers. Consequently, he ‘diluted’ the potentially dangerous ideology of Israel’s God-aided war by pointing to the Deuteronomic idea of God-ordered peaceful relationship of the Israelites with their neighbours, the descendants of Esau (Deut 2:4-8). Yahweh’s aid to Israel is presented in Gen 32:1-33:17 as aid not in Israel’s war but in Israel’s humble, believing, well-thought, and respectful reconciliation with its neighbours.

2.18 Dealing with a Canaanite city in the aftermath of a rape of a virgin in the open field (Gen 33:18-34:31; cf. Deut 20:10-22:29)

The motifs of dealing with an enemy city and of rape of a virgin in the open field (Gen 33:18-34:31) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 20:10-22:29.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 33:18-34:31 and Deut 20:10-20; 22:25-29. It is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: שׁלם\שׁלום (‘deal peacefully / peace’ [with the enemy city]: Gen 33:18; 34:21; Deut 20:10-12), עיר ([enemy] ‘city’: Gen 33:18; 34:20.24-25.27-28; Deut 20:10.14-16.19-20), שׂדה (‘field’ [outside the city]: Gen 33:19; 34:5.7.28; Deut 20:19; 22:25.27), חוי (‘Hivite’ [put under a ban]: Gen 34:2; Deut 20:17), שׁכב (‘lie’ [with a woman]: Gen 34:2.7; Deut 22:25.28-29), ענה (‘violate’ [a girl]: Gen 34:2; Deut 22:29), נער ([violated] ‘girl’: Gen 34:3.12; Deut 22:25-29), אשׁה ([the girl taken as a] ‘wife’: Gen 34:4.8.12; cf. 34:21; Deut 22:29), אב (‘father’ [of the violated girl]: Gen 34:11; Deut 22:29), נתן (‘give’ [money as recompense for violation]: Gen 34:11-12; Deut 22:29), בהמה (‘cattle’ [taken]: Gen 34:23; Deut 20:14), לפי־חרב ([kill the inhabitants of the enemy city] ‘with the edge of the sword’: Gen 34:26; Deut 20:13), בזז (‘plunder’ [the enemy city]: Gen 34:27.29; Deut 20:14), טף (‘little children’ [taken as spoil]: Gen 34:29; Deut 20:14), נשׁים (‘women’ [taken as spoil]: Gen 34:29; Deut 20:14), and נכה (‘strike’ [the enemy city]: Gen 34:30; Deut 20:13).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 33:18-34:31 and Deut 20:10-20; 22:25-29 is quite easy to ascertain. The account Gen 33:18-34:31 is a result of a conflation of the motifs which are contained in Deut 20:10-15 (dealing with an enemy city outside Canaan), Deut 20:16-18 (dealing with a Canaanite city), Deut 22:25-27 (rape of an engaged woman in the open field), and Deut 22:28-29 (rape of a virgin).

Accordingly, the story about Jacob and his sons as dealing with the city of Shechem in the aftermath of Shechem's rape of Dinah (Gen 33:18-34:31) evidently originates from a reworking of the motifs which are contained in Deut 20:10-20 (dealing with enemy cities) and in Deut 22:25-29 (appropriate punishment for the rape of a woman).[287] However, the additional use of the motifs of taking a captive woman to the captor's house and marrying her (Deut 21:11-13) in Gen 34:2-4.8.17.26 and of the firstborn son of an unloved wife (Deut 21:15-17) in Gen 34:25-26.30-31 implies that Gen 33:18-34:31 should be regarded as a hypertextual reworking of the whole section Deut 20:10-22:29.

In particular, the account of Jacob coming to Shechem in the land of Canaan (Gen 33:18-35:4) highlights the importance of this city, as located in the centre of Canaan, in the post-Deuteronomic (cf. Deut 11:29-12:28) theological-geographical perspective of the author of Genesis (cf. Gen 12:5-7; 37:12-14; cf. also Josh 20:7; 24:1-28.32; 1 Kgs 12:1). The narratively redundant identification of Shechem as a city (Gen 33:18; cf. 34:20.24-25.27-28; diff. 12:6; 37:12-14 etc.) and, moreover, as located in the land of Canaan (Gen 33:18) alludes to the Deuteronomic text which refers to dealing with enemy, especially Canaanite, cities (Deut 20:10-20). The semantically unclear reference to Jacob as coming to Shechem peacefully (Gen 33:18; cf. 34:21) and merely buying a plot of land near Shechem (Gen 33:19)[288] in fact alludes to the idea of the Israelites as initially dealing with an enemy city in a peaceful way (Deut 20:10-12). The likewise strange description of Jacob as encamping (חנה) in front of the city (Gen 33:18; diff. 33:19) has a similar military connotation of encamping against an enemy city (cf. Josh 10:31.34; Judg 6:4; 9:50 etc.). The motif of the open field outside the city as the place of Jacob's encamping (Gen 33:19) and as the setting of the account of the rape of the virgin Dinah (Gen 33:19-34:2) originates from the legal texts Deut 20:19 (which refers to the field as the place of laying siege to a city) and Deut 22:25-27 (which refers to the case of rape of an engaged woman in the open field).[289] Accordingly, in Gen 33:18-20 the author of Genesis

---

287 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2002), 518.

288 Cf. F. M. Yamada, *Configurations of Rape in the Hebrew Bible: A Literary Analysis of Three Rape Narratives* (StBL 109; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2008), 29, 53; P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 256-257.

289 The motif of erecting an altar near Shechem and calling it 'God, the God of Israel' (מזבח + אלהי ישׂראל: Gen 33:20) was borrowed from Josh 8:30. The surprising reference to Jacob as 'setting up' and not 'building' the altar (Gen 33:20; diff. 12:7-8; Josh 8:30 etc.)

alluded to the Deuteronomic text which concerns making war against an enemy city (Deut 20:10-20), but he reworked this text in an evidently pacific way.

The description of the eponymous Shechem as a son of a Hivite (Gen 34:2; cf. 33:18-19 etc.) alludes to the Deuteronomic list of Canaanite nations, whose cities should be put under a ban during the holy war (Deut 20:16-17; cf. 7:1; Judg 3:5).[290] The account of Shechem's allegedly typically Gentile sin of sexual immorality (cf. Gen 34:7), which was presented as consisting in lying with a desired, unmarried Israelite girl and in violating her (Gen 34:2-3; cf. 39:7.10.12), is a result of a reworking of two Deuteronomic legal texts: Deut 22:25-27 (which refers to the case of rape of an engaged woman in the open field) and Deut 22:28-29 (which refers to the case of rape of an unmarried girl).[291] By suggesting that the sin took place in the open field, outside the city of Shechem, and that Dinah was solely interested in seeing the daughters of the land (Gen 33:18-34:1), thus behaving in a way typical of a child (cf. Gen 34:4)[292] and of a girl who had only male siblings (cf. Gen 29:32-30:24), the author of Genesis presented the Israelite Dinah as wholly innocent and the Canaanite Shechem as fully guilty of the rape (cf. Deut 22:25-27).[293]

Shechem and his father's conciliatory proposal, consisting in wanting to take Dinah to be Shechem's wife and in offering money to her family as recompense for lying with the unmarried girl (Gen 34:4-8.11-12), narratively illus-

---

most probably alludes to the idea of Joshua as placing the exceptional altar high on a mountain (Josh 8:30) and using only unhewn stones for its construction (Josh 8:31).

290 Cf. J. Van Seters, 'The Silence of Dinah (Genesis 34)', in J.-D. Macchi and T. Römer (eds.), *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Ein mehrstimmiger Kommentar zu A Plural Commentary of Gen 25-36*, Festschrift A. de Pury (MdB 44; Labor et Fides: Genève 2001), 239-247 (esp. 245-246).

291 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 518; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 218-220. It should be noted that the name Dinah (דינה), which is provided with no etymological explanation in Gen 30:21 (diff. 30:20 etc.), is etymologically related to legal judgement (דין). Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 172.

292 Since at the time of the rape Dinah was apparently still a child (Gen 34:4), who was born as the eleventh one among Jacob's children (Gen 30:21), presumably 7-10 years before Jacob's return to Canaan (Gen 30:21-34; 31:41), Shechem's sin may also be classified as a case of paedophilia, which makes it even graver.

293 Cf. R. M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. 2007), 512-517; Y. Shemesh, 'Rape is Rape is Rape: The Story of Dinah and Shechem (Genesis 34)', *ZAW* 119 (2007) 2-21; F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 33-40, 43.

trates the Deuteronomic regulations concerning such a case (Deut 22:28-29). The categorization of Shechem's sin as causing defilement (טמא: Gen 34:5.13; diff. 38:18.24.26),[294] which is later extended to the whole city of Shechem (Gen 34:27), alludes to the Deuteronomic instruction concerning not defiling the land of Canaan (Deut 21:23). Likewise, the categorization of Shechem's sin as grave because he did a disgraceful thing in Israel (כי + נבלה + עשׂה + בישׂראל: Gen 34:7) alludes to the thematically related legal text Deut 22:21, which refers to the case of a woman who had premarital sexual intercourse.[295] By reworking this text, the author of Genesis replaced the Israelite penal formula 'You shall remove the evil from your midst' (Deut 22:21) with the more neutral statement 'Such a thing ought not to be done' (Gen 34:7).

Hamor's general proposal that the Israelites should enter into mixed marriages with the Shechemites and that the Israelites should dwell in Canaan together with the Shechemites (Gen 34:9-10.21) evidently contradicts the well-known Deuteronomic prohibitions Deut 7:1-3.16. Moreover, even the particular name of Hamor (חמור meaning 'ass': Gen 33:19; 34:2-26; cf. 34:28; diff. 13:5; 20:14; 21:27; 26:14; 33:13 etc.), who proposed that the Israelites should be one (אחד) people with the Shechemites (Gen 34:16.22), negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibition Deut 22:10 (cf. 22:9.11).[296] For this reason, the sons of Jacob explain that this proposal cannot be accepted unless the Shechemites' males are circumcised (Gen 34:14-15.17; cf. 34:18-19.22-24). However, even this conciliatory condition contradicts the absolute rule of the holy war in Canaan (Deut 7:1-3.16; cf. 7:6) and is therefore qualified by the narrator as a fraud of the sons of Jacob (Gen 34:13).

The motif of the gate of the city (שׁער + עיר) as the place of settling legal issues concerning marriage and family matters (Gen 34:20; cf. 30:24) was borrowed from Deut 21:19; 22:15.24. The description of Jacob's family as being at peace with the Shechemites (Gen 34:21), which is in fact clearly illusory (cf. Gen 34:7.13.25-29.31), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should initially deal with an enemy city in a peaceful way (Deut 20:10-12), but this rule should not apply to Canaanite cities, whose inhabitants should be put under a ban (Deut 20:16-18). The idea of the Shechemites as wanting to regard

---

294 Cf. F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 40; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 295-296.

295 Cf. J. Van Seters, 'Silence', 243-244; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 518.

296 In the preceding story, Jacob was described as having numerous oxen (שׁור: Gen 32:6).

the Israelites' cattle as their property (Gen 34:23)[297] negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic rule that the cattle should be taken as spoil during the holy war (Deut 20:14; cf. 2:35; 3:7). In this way, the author of Genesis blamed the Shechemites for their being deceitful and therefore at least partially guilty of the subsequent murder of them (Gen 34:25-29).[298]

It should be noted that the description of Shechem's particular behaviour, namely his seeing Dinah, humiliating her, taking her to his house, wanting to take her as his wife, desiring her, and making her (and prospectively her family) dwell with him (ראה + ענה + לקח לאשה + חשק + ישב + בית: Gen 34:2-4.8.10.16-17.21-23.26), presents him as in fact treating Dinah as taken captive from the much weaker Israelites, which alludes to the Deuteronomic text Deut 21:10-14.[299] Accordingly, in Gen 33:19-34:26 Shechem is described as not only a romantic lover but also a mighty prince (cf. Deut 7:1.24)[300] who by his presumptuousness caused the violent Israelite–Canaanite conflict.

Since Dinah was a daughter of Leah, as it was reminded by the narrator at the beginning of the story (Gen 34:1; cf. 30:19-21; 46:15),[301] in a natural way her eldest brother Reuben should feel responsible for defending her honour. However, even though he was born of Jacob's unloved wife Leah (Gen 29:32), according to the Deuteronomic rule Deut 21:15-17 Reuben enjoyed the status of the firstborn son (Gen 35:23; 46:8; 49:3; but cf. 48:5; 49:4). For this reason, the author of Genesis did not want to present Reuben in a bad light by describing him as being guilty of murder (cf. Gen 37:21-22.29-30; 42:22.37; but cf. 35:22; 49:4). Consequently, the author of Genesis described the two subsequent sons of Leah, namely Simeon and Levi (Gen 29:33-34; 35:23), as wreaking bloody vengeance for their sister Dinah (Gen 34:25-26.30-31; cf. 49:5-6). On the other hand, Shechem was presented in Gen 34:25-28 (cf. 34:31) as the place of radical zeal for the traditional law.

The particular, in fact surprising description of the action of Jacob's two or eleven sons against the inhabitants of the city of Shechem, namely killing all the male inhabitants of the enemy city with the edge of the sword, then plundering the enemy city, and taking its women and little children as spoil (Gen 34:25-

---

297 Cf. F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 52-55.

298 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 314; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 298.

299 Cf. J. Van Seters, 'Silence', 246.

300 Cf. F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 33-34.

301 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 590.

29),[302] illustrates the Deuteronomic law concerning the Israelites dealing with an enemy city outside Canaan (Deut 20:13-14; cf. 21:10). The author of Genesis evidently did not apply to Shechem the more ferocious rule concerning not letting anything that breathes remain alive in the cities of Canaan (Deut 20:16-17; cf. 7:2.16; cf. also 2:34; 3:3.6), most probably because he generally reworked the Deuteronomic rules concerning the holy war in a more pacific way (cf. Gen 6:5-8:19; 13:13-14:24). The rather unusual reference to the other sons of Jacob as coming upon the slain (חלל: Gen 34:27; diff. 42:38; 44:9 etc.) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic regulations concerning the Israelites regarding themselves as not guilty of killing the slain person (Deut 21:1-9).

The conclusion of the story presents Simeon and Levi's extremely violent, punishable action (Gen 34:30; cf. 49:5-7) as partially justified inasmuch as it was provoked by the sinful behaviour of the Shechemites (Gen 34:31). Simeon and Levi's reference to Dinah as being treated, in their opinion by all male inhabitants of the city (עיר: Gen 34:25), like a harlot (זנה: Gen 34:31) alludes to the Deuteronomic instruction concerning the responsibility of the men of the city for punishing a woman who behaved like a harlot in her father's house (Deut 22:21).[303] On the other hand, Simeon and Levi's impertinent answer (Gen 34:31) to their apparently weak and not loquacious father's rebuke (Gen 34:30; cf. 34:5-17) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic law concerning a stubborn and rebellious son, who does not listen to his father's voice and rebuke (Deut 21:18-21).

Accordingly, in Gen 33:18-34:31 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic text Deut 20:10-22:29, especially its laws concerning dealing with an enemy city during the holy war (Deut 20:10-18), taking a captive woman to the captor's house in order to marry her (Deut 21:10-14), the status of the firstborn son who was born of the unloved wife (Deut 21:15-17), and rape of a woman (Deut 22:25-29), into the quasi-folkloristic[304] story about the rape of an Israelite virgin outside a Canaanite city, which was avenged by her brothers, but not by the one who was the firstborn of his father. By means of combining the Deuter-

---

302 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 3, 447-448; F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 58-61; P. D. Vrolijk, *Wealth*, 276-277, 281.

303 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 518. Consequently, Simeon and Levi blame all male Shechemites for regarding Dinah as at least partially guilty of her sexual intercourse with Shechem. For this reason, they justify their action as defending their sister's honour.

304 Cf. M. J. Williams, *Deception*, 200.

onomic idea of the holy war with that of heavy punishment for a grave sin, the author of Genesis presented the Israelites' holy war against the Canaanite inhabitants of Shechem as at least partially justified by the Shechemites' sinful, presumptuous, and deceitful behaviour. However, by introducing the image of Jacob's passivity (Gen 34:5; cf. 34:6-17) and of his subsequent reproach about Simeon and Levi's violent action (Gen 34:30) the author of Genesis suggested that Israel's idea of imposing a destructive ban on the Canaanite cities should generally be avoided as morally disproportionate (in terms of the law of nations) and politically dangerous.[305]

2.19 Fulfilling vows, taking the wife of one's father, and accepting the Edomites (Gen 35-36; cf. Deut 23:1-24)

The motifs of fulfilling vows, taking the wife of one's father, and accepting the Edomites (Gen 35-36) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 23:1-24.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 35:1-15.22 (cf. 28:19-22; 31:13) and Deut 23:1.22-24. It is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: נדר נדר ('make a vow': Gen 28:20; 31:13; Deut 23:22), עשׂה ('make/perform' [according to the vow]: Gen 35:1.3; Deut 23:24), and אב ('father' [whose wife was defiled]: Gen 35:22; Deut 23:1).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 35:1-15.22 (cf. 28:19-22; 31:13) and Deut 23:1.22-24 is quite easy to ascertain. The use of the key word עשׂה ('perform') in Deut 23:24 influenced the account Gen 35:1-15 in such a way that the phrase בנה מזבח ('build an altar': cf. Gen 8:12; 12:7-8; 13:18; 22:9; 26:25 and esp. 35:7), which is normally used in Genesis, was replaced in Gen 35:1.3 with the phrase עשׂה מזבח ('make an altar': cf. Gen 13:4), which is exceptional in this writing. Moreover, the instruction Deut 23:1 suits its context of marital relationships (cf. Deut 22:13-29), whereas the account of Reuben lying with his father's wife (Gen 35:22) is very awkwardly inserted into the account of giving birth to Jacob's sons (Gen 35:16-26).

Accordingly, the accounts of Jacob fulfilling his vows (Gen 35:1-15; cf. 28:19-22; 31:13) and Reuben lying with his father's wife (Gen 35:22) illustrate the Deuteronomic legal regulations which are contained in Deut 23:1.22-24.

305 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 3, 452-453; F. M. Yamada, *Configurations*, 61-65.

However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the larger sections Deut 23:1-24 and Gen 35-36 reveals that the latter is a well-thought hypertextual reworking of the former.

In particular, Yahweh's introductory command Gen 35:1 and Jacob's response to it (Gen 35:3) recalls the motif of Bethel as the place in which God revealed himself to Jacob (Gen 28:13-15) and in which Jacob made a vow concerning regarding Bethel as a sanctuary of God (Gen 28:20-22; 31:13).[306] This vow shall now be fulfilled (Gen 35:3.6-15), which illustrates the Deuteronomic command Deut 23:22.[307] The particular idea of 'making' and not 'building' an altar at Bethel (Gen 35:1.3; cf. 13:4; diff. 8:12; 12:7-8; 13:18; 22:9; 26:25; 35:7 and Deut 27:5-6) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of performing something according to the vow which was earlier taken (Deut 23:24). The related, later not fully obeyed (cf. Gen 35:7-8.14-16) command concerning Jacob's dwelling (ישב) at Bethel, regarded as the place in which Jacob found a refuge when he fled from his powerful brother Esau (Gen 35:1; cf. 35:7), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that a slave who saved himself from his master (עבד + אדון + נצל: cf. Gen 32:5-6.12.19; 33:14) should dwell in one of Israel's places or cities (Deut 23:16-17).

Jacob's order concerning removing foreign gods from the midst (תוך) of his household and concerning their purifying (טהר) themselves (Gen 35:2; cf. 35:4) illustrates the Deuteronomic instruction concerning removing everything which is not ritually clean from the midst of Israel's camp (Deut 23:10-15). The related, somewhat surprising description of Jacob's household as giving to him the rings (נזם) which were in their ears (אזן: Gen 35:4) is a result of a conflation of the Deuteronomic instructions concerning using equipment (אזן) for hiding uncleanness (Deut 23:14) and concerning not bringing the wages of a harlot to God's house (Deut 23:19; cf. Hos 2:7.15). The likewise strange description of Jacob as hiding all these objects, which allusively illustrate the idea of uncleanness,[308] under the terebinth tree (אלה) which was by Shechem (Gen 35:4; cf. Josh 24:26) originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic instruction concerning hiding unclean excrements (Deut 23:13-15) with the motif of a sacred great tree (אלון) near Shechem (Deut 11:29-30; Judg 9:6.37; Gen 12:6; cf. 35:8).

---

306 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 611.

307 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 554; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 246-248.

308 Cf. V. A. Hurovitz, 'Who Lost an Earring? Genesis 35:4 Reconsidered', *CBQ* 62 (2000) 28-32 (esp. 31).

The idea of the Canaanites as not pursuing (רדף אחרי) the sons of Jacob (Gen 35:5), although they were supposed to do so in order to avenge the recently killed Shechemites (cf. Gen 34:30),[309] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of cities of refuge, in which the avenger of blood should not pursue the killer who is not deserving death (Deut 19:1-10; cf. 4:41-43). This motif is similar to that of a refuge for a runaway slave (Deut 23:16-17; cf. Gen 35:1), and for this reason it was used in Gen 35:5.[310] The narratively superfluous description of the death and burial (under the great tree at Bethel) of Rebekah's nurse (Gen 35:8),[311] who must have abandoned either Isaac's or Laban's house since she came to Bethel with the fugitive Jacob (Gen 35:8; diff. 24:59; 35:27), probably also alludes to the motifs of Israel's cities of refuge (Deut 23:16-17) and of hiding uncleanness (Deut 23:14; cf. Gen 35:4). The surprising name of the oak at Bethel as the 'oak of weeping' (Gen 35:8) alludes to the prophetic idea of Jacob as weeping (בכה) at Bethel (Hos 12:5).

The account of God renewedly blessing (ברך) Jacob after his coming from the place of slavery in Paddan-aram (Gen 35:9; cf. 31:3-18; 33:18) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of God as blessing the Israelites after their coming out of Egypt, in place of the curse which was uttered against them by Balaam, who originated from Aram-naharaim (Deut 23:5-6; cf. Gen 24:10). The author of Genesis conflated this idea with that of Jacob as seeking God's favour at Bethel (Hos 12:5) in the account of Jacob's variegated cultic actions at Bethel (Gen 35:2-4.6-7.14-15). The content of God's blessing, which refers to Jacob as being fruitful in the land (ארץ) that God gives to him (Gen 35:11-12; cf. 35:19), alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of God as blessing the Israelites in the land of Canaan (Deut 23:21). Moreover, the text of Gen 35:11 broadens the scope of God's blessing by referring to an assembly (קהל) of nations (cf. Gen 28:3; 48:4), thus alluding to the Deuteronomic idea of the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:2-4.9), an idea which will be further reworked in Gen 35:22-36:43. The repeatedly declared form of the blessing, namely that of God's speaking (דבר) with Jacob

---

309 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 301.

310 It is possible that the author of Genesis regarded Bethel (as the place of the ancient, well-known sanctuary) and not Shechem, whose sanctuary on Mount Gerizim was most probably at that time (second half of the fifth century BC) still under construction, as the city of refuge in central Canaan (diff. Josh 20:7; 21:21).

311 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 3, 481.

‘there’ (שׁם),[312] that is at Bethel (Gen 35:13-15; cf. 35:1.3.7), again alludes to Hos 12:5.

The name Ephrath as vaguely pointing to the place of the death and burial of Rachel (Gen 35:16-20) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of Israel’s prosperity in the land of Canaan (Deut 23:21; cf. Gen 35:11). The name Ephrath was regarded as etymologically related to Ephraim (Judg 12:5; cf. 1 Sam 1:1; 1 Kgs 11:26; cf. also Ruth 1:2; 1 Sam 17:12) and to being fruitful (Gen 41:52; cf. Hos 13:5). Most probably for the latter reason, it was somewhat artificially identified with Bethlehem,[313] that is the ‘house of bread’ (Gen 35:19; 48:7; cf. Mi 5:1; cf. also Ruth 4:11). The author of Genesis, in agreement with Jer 31:15, evidently regarded the place of the death and burial of Rachel as located relatively close to Bethel, near Ramah, on the border of the territory of Benjamin (Gen 35:16-19; cf. 1 Sam 10:2; cf. also Ps 132:6).[314]

The identification of the place of Reuben’s sin (Gen 35:22) with the ‘tower of the flock’ (מגדל־עדר: Gen 35:21) clearly alludes to the prophetic text Mi 4:8, which refers to Jerusalem. In this way, the Israelite author of Genesis presented Jerusalem as the place of a grave, abominable sin, and consequently as the place of violation of the Mosaic law and of lasting uncleanness (cf. Josh 15:8.63; 18:16.28; Judg 1:21; 19:10-12).[315] The particular nature of Reuben’s sin, namely that of lying with his father’s concubine Bilhah (Gen 35:22), negatively illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of taking the wife of one’s father (Deut 23:1).[316] Since Bilhah was the mother of Dan (Gen 30:5-6; 35:25), it is possible

---

312 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 300 n. 485.

313 Cf. N. M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary 1; Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia · New York · Jerusalem 1989), 407-408; J. Blenkinsopp, ‘Benjamin Traditions’, 630-633.

314 It should be noted that there are many ideological claims in the Judaean texts which point to the northern, Ephraimite origin of the clan of Samuel (1 Sam 1:1), the ark (Ps 132:6; 1 Sam 1:3), and the clan of David (Ruth 1:2; 4:11; 1 Sam 17:12; 2 Sam 5:1). On the other hand, it is possible that the author of Genesis regarded the border of Benjamin as the border of the ‘proper’, northern Israel (for a similar idea, see Josh 18:28). Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 305 n. 506. Cf. also D. Volgger, *Und dann wirst du gewiss sterben: Zu den Todesbildern im Pentateuch* (ATSAT 92; EOS: St. Ottilien 2010), 85-86.

315 This fact again implies that the book of Genesis, like the book of Joshua and the book of Judges, is an Israelite and not a Judaean writing.

316 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 527, 534; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 221-223.

that Gen 35:22 alludes to the allegedly Judaean origins of the condemned sanctuary at Dan (cf. Judg 17-18). Moreover, with his description of Reuben's abominable sin, the author of Genesis presented Reuben as effectively rejected from the position of the firstborn son (in favour of Joseph: cf. Gen 48:5; 49:3-4.22-26).[317] Most probably in order to illustrate the loss of Reuben's status in Israel, the author of Genesis concluded the account with the somewhat surprising statement 'and Israel heard of it' (Gen 35:22).

The subsequent, narratively redundant list of Jacob's twelve sons,[318] who were somewhat passively (Gen 35:26) born to him (Gen 35:22-26), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:2-4.9). The reference to Isaac residing as alien in the region of Hebron (Gen 35:27; cf. 12:10; 19:9; 20:1; 21:23.34; 26:3; 32:5; 47:4; cf. also Deut 23:8)[319] presents Judaea as a territory which is located outside Canaan proper. The subsequent account of the old age, death, and burial of Isaac (Gen 35:28-29) depicts him as living very long (Gen 35:28), being full of days (ימים), and seeing all his children and grandchildren (בן) before his death (Gen 35:29; cf. 35:22-27), and consequently as being greatly blessed by God (cf. Deut 23:6; cf. also 6:2-3).

The long genealogy of the descendants of Esau, that is Edom (אדום: Gen 36:1.8-9.16-17.19.21.31-32.43), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Edomites in the third generation may enter the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:8-9).[320] The author of Genesis reworked this idea by constructing a bipartite genealogical tree, which ultimately reaches Esau's twelve descendants in the third

---

317 It should be noted that Reuben's sin may be regarded as an usurpation of his father's position in the family already before Jacob's death: cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 327; V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 387. For this reason, the inevitable loss of Reuben's status of the firstborn son in the consequence of his usurpation is yet more striking.

318 Since in Gen 35:22 Bilhah is called a concubine (diff. 29:29; 30:3-4.7; 35:25), the sons of Bilhah, as well as those of Zilpah, are placed at the end of the list Gen 35:22-26 (cf. 46:23-25), thus reflecting the idea that their place in the assembly of Yahweh, in line with the idea of Deut 23:3, is rather questionable (cf. Deut 27:13; Judg 5:15-17; 18:1-31). Consequently, the position of Joseph in Gen 35:22-26 is more elevated, thus preparing the long story about him (Gen 37-50). Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 629.

319 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 630.

320 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 535.

generation (Gen 36:1-5.9-14)[321] and which is inserted after the list of the twelve sons of Jacob (Gen 35:22-29)[322] and after the description of Isaac as being buried by both Esau and Jacob (Gen 35:27-29). In this way, the author of Genesis depicted a broadened assembly of Yahweh.[323]

The name of Esau's Canaanite wife Oholibamah (Gen 36:2) alludes to Oholibah, Ezekiel's symbolic name for Jerusalem (Ezek 23:4.11.22.36.44).[324] Consequently, the Israelite author of Genesis presented Jerusalem as a Canaanite city, related to an oppressive (ענה) and unclean small hyena (צבעון), and 'married' to Edom (cf. Josh 15:8.63; 18:16.28; Judg 1:21; 19:10-12).[325] Moreover, the descendants of the allusive Oholibamah reach only to the second and not to the third generation (Gen 36:14.18; diff. 36:11-13.15-17), thus apparently not entering the assembly of Yahweh (cf. Deut 23:9).

In the whole Edomite genealogy, only female characters function as subjects of the verb ילד ('bear': Gen 36:4-5.12.14; diff. 5:3-32; 10:8-11:27 etc.) in the predominantly male genealogy Gen 36:1-19. In this way, the author of Genesis alluded to the Deuteronomic text Deut 23:9, which refers to the descendants who 'were born' (יולדו) to Esau in the third generation.

The genealogical list of the descendants of Seir the Horite, who lived before Esau in the land of Seir (Gen 36:20-30), a list which reaches the generation of Esau's wife Oholibamah, illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the descendants of Esau dispossessed the Horites who had formerly inhabited Seir (Deut 2:12.22).[326] This idea is also conveyed by contraposing the lists of fourteen chiliarchs of the Edomites (Gen 36:15-19; cf. also 36:40-43) and only seven chil-

---

321 Amalek, an ancient foe of the Israelites (Deut 25:17-19), who is presented in Gen 36:12 as an illegitimate son of a concubine, in line with Deut 23:3 should not be counted in the assembly of Yahweh. Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 646, 650.

322 Cf. ibid. 632, 646.

323 It is possible that the author of Genesis regarded the inhabitants of Edom as somehow related to the worship of Yahweh. This idea is not far from modern archaeological considerations which suggest the presence of ancient worship of Yahweh south of Judaea.

324 For this reason, the name Oholibamah should be interpreted as meaning 'My tent [has become] a high place'.

325 For a similar idea, see Gen 26:34 which presents Esau's Judaean wife as a Hittite. This fact again implies that the book of Genesis, like the book of Joshua and the book of Judges, is an Israelite and not a Judaean writing.

326 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 647-648.

iarchs of the Horites (Gen 36:21.29-30).[327] Moreover, the genealogical list Gen 36:20-30 again in an exceptional way refers to Oholibamah (cf. Gen 36:2), presenting her as a Canaanite, this time as a Horite (Gen 36:25).

The list of the Edomite kings (Gen 36:31-39) most probably illustrates the idea of the assembly of Yahweh as also including Gentile kings (Gen 35:11). Moreover, the first character in this list, namely Bela son of Beor (בלע בן־בעור: Gen 26:32), clearly alludes to the character of Balaam son of Beor (בלעם בן־בעור: Deut 23:5; cf. also Mi 6:5 etc.), who cursed the Israelites (Deut 23:6). Accordingly, the author of Genesis presented the first Edomite king as an enemy of Israel.[328] However, the statement that the fourth king Hadad son of Bedad defeated the Midianites in the field of Moab (Gen 36:35) alludes to the thought that whereas the Moabites should be regarded as Israel's enemies, the Edomites in the third generation may enter the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:4-9; cf. also Is 9:3 etc.). For this reason, the conclusive, narratively superfluous names in the list (Mehetabel, Matred, and Me-zahab: Gen 36:39) have positive etymological meanings.[329]

Accordingly, the story about Jacob's preparations before coming to Bethel, his intense religious activity in Bethel, his family problems, the death and burial of Isaac, and the early history of the Edomites (Gen 35-36) in a hypertextual way illustrates the ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 23:1-24. The author of Genesis presented Jacob as purifying his household in a cultic way, and as fulfilling his vows. Besides, the author of Genesis presented the congregation of Yahweh as consisting of the twelve tribes of Israel, among whom neither Reuben, who did not respect his father's intimate marital relationships, nor Judah, who was regarded as unclean and oppressive, enjoyed a privileged status. On the other hand, this congregation also included the Edomites, who from the third generation onwards could be viewed by the Israelites in a positive way.

---

327 Accordingly, the chiliarchs of the third generation of the Edomites (Gen 36:15-19), who already belong to the assembly of Yahweh, are presented by the author of Genesis as fighting a holy war against the Horites (Gen 36:21-30).

328 For this reason, the list Gen 36:31-39 should probably be interpreted as containing one negative (anti-Israelite) character and seven fairly positive ones.

329 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 658: 'continuous streams of gold'.

2.20 Not returning home after being hated there and being sent away from there, and selling an Israelite into slavery (Gen 37; cf. Deut 23:25-24:22)

The ideas of not returning home after being hated there and being sent away from there, and of selling an Israelite into slavery (Gen 37) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 23:25-24:22.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 37 and Deut 24:7. It is provided by several common key words of both texts: אחיו ('his brothers' [sons of Israel]: Gen 37:2.4-5.8-12.17.19.23.26-27.30; cf. 37:13-14.16; Deut 24:7), בן ('son' [of Israel]: Gen 37:2-3.32-35; Deut 24:7), ישׂראל ('Israel': Gen 37:3.13; Deut 24:7), נפשׁ ([kidnapped] 'life/person': Gen 37:21; Deut 24:7), and מכר ('sell' [an Israelite]: Gen 37:27-28.36; Deut 24:7).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 37 and Deut 24:7 is relatively easy to ascertain. The surprising use of the name Israel in Gen 37:3.13 (diff. Jacob in Gen 37:1-2.34) seems to be influenced by the use of this name in Deut 24:7, and not vice versa.

Accordingly, the story about selling Joseph, one of Israel's sons, into slavery (Gen 37) illustrates the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 24:7. However, a detailed intertextual analysis of Gen 37 and of the larger section Deut 23:25-24:22 reveals that Gen 37 is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the section Deut 23:25-24:22. In fact, Gen 37 illustrates several important ideas of this Deuteronomic section: particular behaviour in the harvest time (Deut 23:25-26; 24:19),[330] not returning home after being hated in there and being sent away from there (Deut 24:1-4), not selling an Israelite into slavery (Deut 24:7),[331] and regarding Egypt as the place of slavery of the Israelites (Deut 24:18.22).

In particular, the introduction to the story presents Joseph as being responsible for his brothers by shepherding them (רעה את־אחיו: Gen 37:2; cf. Is 63:11; Jer 3:15; 23:4; Ezek 34:23; 37:24; diff. Gen 37:12 etc.)[332] and by reporting about some of them to their father (Gen 37:2). Moreover, it presents Joseph as Israel's most beloved son (Gen 37:3),[333] who was dedicated to Yahweh in a special way

---

330 *Pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 282-285.

331 Cf. D. L. Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12, 572; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 261-262.

332 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 406.

333 This fact once more proves that the author of Genesis was an Israelite and not a Jew.

(cf. Deut 33:16; Gen 49:26).[334] In this way, the author of Genesis gave the first narrative reason for the future selling of Joseph, one of Israel's sons, by his brothers into slavery (Gen 34:4; cf. 37:27-28.36).[335]

On the other hand, the motif of Joseph being hated by his relatives with such intensity that it precluded normal social contacts within the family (Gen 37:4-5.8)[336] alludes to the Deuteronomic instruction concerning a wife who is detested by her husband and consequently sent away from his house (Deut 24:3; cf. 22:13-14.16-17; 24:1). The author of Genesis applied this Deuteronomic instruction to the character of the seventeen-year-old, and consequently marriageable and divorceable young man Joseph (Gen 37:2), although Joseph is a male and not a female character. Moreover, in his description of Joseph's first dream (Gen 37:7)[337] the author of Genesis alluded to the Deuteronomic instructions concerning dealing with standing grain (קמה: Deut 23:26) and with a particular sheaf in the field during the harvest (Deut 24:19). The content of Joseph's second dream (Gen 37:9) presents Joseph in post-Deuteronomic terms as overcoming the Israelite temptation to worship the sun, the moon, and the stars (Deut 4:19),[338] and consequently as being blessed with the precious produce of the sun and the moon (Deut 33:14).

The somewhat surprising images of Israel as sending his beloved son Joseph away from his house and of Joseph as obediently going far away, from Hebron to the north of Shechem,[339] although Israel also wanted him to return home (Gen 37:12-17), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of sending a detested wife out of

---

334 The narratively redundant motif of Israel making a specially ornamented tunic for Joseph (עשׂה + כתנת: Gen 37:3; cf. also 37:23.31-33) recalls the motif of priesthood (cf. Exod 28:4.39-40; 39:27; cf. also 28:40; 29:5.8; 40:14; Lev 8:7.13; 10:5; 16:4).

335 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 684.

336 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50* (HTKAT; Herder: Freiburg · Basel · Wien 2007), 60.

337 Cf. R. Pirson, *The Lord of the Dreams: A Semantic and Literary Analysis of Genesis 37-50* (JSOTSup 355; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2002), 47-50; J.-D. Döhling, 'Die Herrschaft erträumen, die Träume beherrschen: Herrschaft, Traum und Wirklichkeit in den Josefsträumen (Gen 37,5-11) und der Israel-Josefsgeschichte', *BZ*, NF 50 (2006) 1-30 (esp. 3).

338 It should be noted that in the narrative of Genesis Joseph's second dream cannot be interpreted as a simple allegory because at that narrated time Joseph's mother Rachel was already dead (cf. Gen 35:19). Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 411.

339 Cf. ibid. 414; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 684, 686; L. Ruppert, *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, vol. 4, *Gen 37,1 – 50,26* (FzB 118; Echter: Würzburg 2008), 109.

her husband's house and of her going to another house, although her previous husband might want her to return to him (Deut 24:1-4). The narratively redundant account of Joseph being found in the field (מצא + בשׂדה) by another man (אישׁ: Gen 37:15-17) alludes to the instruction concerning the wife who was taken and sent away again by another man, after her departure from her former husband's house (Deut 24:2-3; cf. 22:25.27).

The description of the resolve of Joseph's brothers to kill him because of his dreams (Gen 37:19-20; cf. 37:5-10) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of killing a prophet or dreamer who turns the Israelites away from Yahweh (Deut 13:2-6). By contrast, the author of Genesis regarded Joseph as the most devout Yahwist among the sons of Israel (Gen 49:26; cf. Deut 33:16).

The additional motif of throwing the prophet-like character of the dreamer Joseph into a cistern in which there was no water (שׁלך + בור + אין + מים: Gen 37:24; cf. 37:20.22) was borrowed from Jer 38:6 (cf. 23:25-28). Likewise, the subsequent description of pulling up and lifting Joseph from the cistern (וימשׁכו ויעלו את מן־הבור: Gen 37:28), and eventually selling him into slavery in Egypt (Gen 37:28.36), evidently alludes to the similar description of delivering Jeremiah (Jer 38:13; cf. 38:10), who was eventually taken to Egypt (Jer 43:5-44:30).

Reuben's resolve to deliver Joseph (Gen 37:21-22; cf. 37:29-30) presents Israel's firstborn son in a positive way, as acting in line with the Deuteronomic instructions concerning not taking another person's life (נכה נפשׁ: Deut 19:6) and not shedding innocent blood (שׁפך דם: Deut 19:10). However, Reuben's desire to bring Joseph back to his father (Gen 37:22) could not be narratively fulfilled because the Deuteronomic instruction which concerns the wife who was hated in her husband's house and sent away from his house (Deut 24:1-4) prohibits such a return.

The somewhat surprising idea of Joseph's brothers as quietly eating bread (Gen 37:25)[340] may allude to the Deuteronomic instructions concerning eating grain in the harvest time (Deut 23:25-26). The motif of the Ishmaelites, which is surprisingly used in the context of that of not killing Joseph in the cistern (Gen 37:25.27-28; diff. 37:28.36: Midianites),[341] may allude to the well-known character of Ishmael (Jer 41:7-9).

---

340 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 98; L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 4, 113.

341 Cf. R. Pirson, *Lord*, 74; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 698; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 320-321.

The motif of Egypt regarded as the place of slavery of the Israelite Joseph (Gen 37:25.28.36) alludes to the Deuteronomic text Deut 24:18.22. Judah's depraved consideration concerning having no profit from concealing the blood of his brother (כסה + דם: Gen 37:26) alludes to the prophetic indictment against Jerusalem (Ezek 24:7-8). Likewise, Judah's only apparently positive resolve to sell his Israelite brother Joseph into slavery (Gen 37:27-28; cf. 37:36) evidently contradicts the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 24:7.[342] In this way, the Israelite author of Genesis presented Judah in a very bad light, as deserving the penalty of death.[343]

The somewhat strange description of Joseph's brothers as dipping Joseph's tunic in blood and sending it (!) instead of Joseph to his father (Gen 37:31-35)[344] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the wife who was sent away from her husband's house may not return there because this would be an abomination before Yahweh (Deut 24:4). The author of Genesis reworked this particular Deuteronomic idea with the use of the easily understandable image of returning an abhorrent, unclean object to Joseph's former house.

Accordingly, in Gen 37 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic legal instructions Deut 23:25-24:22 with the use of the widely understandable literary motif of sibling rivalry. He presented Joseph in very positive terms as an innocent, Jeremiah-like prophet, who was hated by his kinsmen, sent away forever, like a divorced wife, from his family house, and eventually sold by his wicked brother Judah into slavery in Egypt, which constituted a grave violation of the Israelite solidarity and law.

2.21 Being publicly but not excessively ashamed for not fulfilling levirate obligations (Gen 38; cf. Deut 25:1-10)

The idea of being publicly but not excessively ashamed for not fulfilling levirate obligations (Gen 38) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 25:1-10.

---

342 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 572; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 101; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 173-174.

343 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 421.

344 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 356; V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 425 n. 1; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 104, 108.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 38 and Deut 25:5-10. It is provided by the key word יבם ('act as a brother-in-law'), which is distinctive of both texts in the Bible (Gen 38:8; Deut 25:5.7), and by several other common key words: מות ([husband] 'die': Gen 38:7.10-11; Deut 25:5-6), בוא ('come in' [to the deceased relative's wife]: Gen 38:8-9.16.18; Deut 25:5), אשה ('wife' [of the deceased brother]: Gen 38:8-9.14; Deut 25:5), אח ([deceased] 'brother': Gen 38:8-9.11; cf. 38:29-30; Deut 25:5-7.9), קום ('raise up' [posterity]: Gen 38:8; Deut 25:6-7), ילד ('bear' [a son with the deceased husband's relative]: Gen 38:27-28; Deut 25:6), and שׁם ('name' [of the son of the relative]: Gen 38:29-30; Deut 25:6-7).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 38 and Deut 25:5-10 is quite easy to ascertain. The instruction Deut 25:5-10 suits its context of male-female relationships (cf. Deut 25:11-12), whereas the account of Tamar's sexual relationships (Gen 38) is very awkwardly inserted in the account of selling Joseph into slavery in Egypt (Gen 37-39).[345]

Accordingly, the story about Judah and Tamar (Gen 38) illustrates the Deuteronomic instructions concerning levirate obligations (Deut 25:5-10).[346] However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the larger section Deut 25:1-10 and Gen 38 reveals that the former functioned as a hypotext for the latter.

In particular, the introduction to the story (Gen 38:1-5) provides the setting for the account of Tamar's sexual relationships in Judah's family (Gen 38:6-30). Moreover, already in this introduction the Israelite author of Genesis presented Judah in a bad light by describing him as having taken for himself a Canaanite wife (Gen 38:2), contrary to the Deuteronomic prohibition Deut 7:1-3.[347]

---

345 Cf. A. Wénin, 'Le temps dans histoire de Joseph (Gn 37-50): Repères temporels pour une analyse narrative', *Bib* 83 (2002) 28-53 (esp. 30-32); J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 119; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 173-174.

346 Cf. H.-C. Schmitt, 'Die Josephsgeschichte und das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk: Genesis 38 und 48-50', in M. Vervenne and J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature*, Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans (BETL 133; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 1997), 391-405 (esp. 402); D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 600, 605, 607; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 295-297.

347 Cf. R. J. Clifford, 'Genesis 38: Its Contribution to the Jacob Story', *CBQ* 66 (2004) 519-532 (esp. 524-525); B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 326. *Pace* O. Artus, 'The Literary Tensions and Conflicts of Identity in the "Story of Joseph" (Gen 37:2-50:26)', *ITS* 46 (2009) no. 4, 73-90 (esp. 85), who suggests that Gen 38 prepares the universal perspective of Gen 39-45.

The unexpected death of Er, who was, quite naturally for Judah's firstborn son as viewed from the Israelite perspective of Genesis, wicked in the sight of Yahweh (Gen 38:7), creates the situation which is dealt with in Deut 25:5.[348] Consequently, Judah's order given to his second son Onan, namely that he should go in to his brother's wife and perform the duty of a brother-in-law to her, in order to raise up offspring for his brother (בוא + אשת + אח + ויבם + קום + לאח: Gen 38:8), almost verbatim quotes the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:5-6 (cf. also 25:7).[349]

Onan's actions, which illustrate the negative case that is dealt with in Deut 25:7, are provided with a partial explanation of the narrator (Gen 38:9). However, this explanation does not fully justify Onan's violation of the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:5-6. For this reason, in order to allude to the idea of an Israelite trial (Deut 25:7-10), the author of Genesis described Yahweh as punishing Onan for his misdeeds (Gen 38:10).

The most important part of the plot of the story (Gen 38:11-30), resulting from Judah's resolve not to give Tamar his third son Shelah ('the resting, negligent one'; born in Chezib, i.e. 'lie': Gen 38:5), which is also partially explained by the narrator (Gen 38:11.14), likewise contradicts the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:5-6. Accordingly, it is primarily Judah who is presented by the Israelite author of Genesis as violating the Israelite law.[350] However, in his case, in difference to that of Onan (Gen 38:10), there is no direct divine punishment. Judah is publicly humiliated according to his own wicked deeds, in line with the Deuteronomic ideas of Deut 25:1-3.

The folkloristic story about Tamar's apparently sinful way of acquiring children with her father-in-law and about Judah's apparently justifiable sexual intercourse with her (Gen 38:12-23)[351] presents her as morally innocent (esp. Gen

---

348 For recent analyses of this custom, see D. E. Weisberg, 'The Widow of Our Discontent: Levirate Marriage in the Bible and Ancient Israel', *JSOT* 28.4 (2004) 403-429 (esp. 413-417, 423-428); R. M. Davidson, *Flame*, 461-483.

349 Cf. H.-C. Schmitt, 'Josephsgeschichte', 402. The fact that Onan should only have a son with Tamar, without necessarily marrying her (Gen 38:8; diff. Deut 25:5-6), probably reflects the relatively late, predominantly monogamistic ideology of Genesis (Gen 1:27; 6:18-20 etc.). Most probably, the same idea justifies Tamar's delay in attempting to have sex with Judah up to the moment when he became a widower (Gen 38:12-14).

350 Cf. R. J. Clifford, 'Genesis 38', 525-526.

351 Cf. M. J. Williams, *Deception*, 202.

38:14) and him as morally guilty (esp. Gen 38:18).[352] The setting of the trial and humiliation of Judah, namely the entrance to the otherwise unknown place called Enaim (עינים: Gen 38:14.21),[353] probably illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the trial should take place at the gate of a town, in the eyes (עינים) of the elders (Deut 25:7-9; cf. 25:3). By his 'coming in' to Tamar (Gen 38:16.18), Judah unconsciously carries out the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:5. The description of Judah as recklessly giving his sings of authority in Jerusalem, namely his signet (cf. Jer 22:4), cord (cf. Ezek 40:3), and staff (cf. Ezek 19:11-12.14), to a prostitute (Gen 38:18.23.25)[354] presents Judah in a bad light as effectively rejected from his authority position (cf. Jer 3:1-11; Ezek 16:15-43; 23:1-49; cf. also Gen 37:8).[355] It may also allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the offended woman should remove the sandal, that is an element of personal belongings, of her guilty relative (Deut 25:9-10).

The account of Judah conducting a trial over the alleged sins of his daughter-in-law (Gen 38:24-26) reflects the main ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 25:1-3. Judah's command to burn Tamar for her whoredom (זנה + שׂרף: Gen 38:24) is apparently justified by the prophetic text Ezek 16:41 (cf. also Lev 21:9). However, the decisive act of the trial (Gen 38:26) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the truly righteous person should be declared righteous and the wicked person should be declared wicked (Deut 25:1). The moral punishment, consisting in bringing public shame on Judah (Gen 38:25-26), illustrates the thematically related Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:9-10. On the other hand, narrator's statement that Judah had no more sexual intercourse with his daughter-in-law (Gen 38:26) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the guilty person should not be punished more than it is necessary (Deut 25:3), lest he be too humiliated in public.

---

352 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 327-328.

353 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 718.

354 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 136-137. Against the background of the Deuteronomic prohibition Deut 23:18 the description of Hirah as quite naturally asking about a cult prostitute (קדשה) at Enaim (Gen 38:21-22; diff. זנה: Gen 38:15.24) suggests that Hirah was narratively presented as a Canaanite (cf. Gen 38:1-2), and Adullam, Enaim, and Timnah were regarded as predominantly Canaanite places (cf. Judg 14:1-3). This fact additionally blames Judah for going down from Canaan proper, departing from his Israelite brothers (Gen 38:1), and maintaining close relationships with the Canaanites (Gen 38:1-2.12.20.23; diff. Deut 7:1-3).

355 Cf. R. J. Clifford, 'Genesis 38', 526; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 181.

The conclusion of the story, which refers to the birth of Judah and Tamar's sons (Gen 38:27-30), negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 25:6, which states that the firstborn son who was born by the wife of the deceased husband should succeed to his name. It is evident that neither of Tamar's sons, who struggled for the privilege of being firstborn (Gen 38:28), was given the name of any of Tamar's deceased husbands Er and Onan (Gen 38:29-30; cf. 38:6-10).[356] In this way, the Israelite author of Genesis once more presented Judah in a bad light as at least indirectly violating the Deuteronomic law concerning levirate obligations (Deut 25:5-6).

Accordingly, in Gen 38 the author of Genesis reworked the Israelite regulations concerning doing justice, especially in family matters (Deut 25:1-10), with the use of widely understandable, folkloristic motifs which are related to family matters. In particular, he substituted the Israelite institution of the trial before the elders of the town (Deut 25:7-9; cf. 25:1-3) with the ideas of Yahweh's punishment of the guilty person (Gen 38:7.10) and of humiliation of the guilty person in public (Gen 38:25-26).

2.22 Coming to Egypt alone, bringing first fruits and tithes, blessing and cursing, and being set above the Gentiles (Gen 39:1-41:46; cf. Deut 25:11-28:7)

The ideas of coming to Egypt alone, bringing first fruits and tithes, blessing and cursing, and being set above the Gentiles (Gen 39:1-41:46) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 25:11-28:7.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 39:1-41:46 and Deut 26:5.19. It is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: ירד מצרימה ('go down to Egypt': Gen 39:1; Deut 26:5), נתן על כל ('set over/above all': Gen 41:41.43; cf. 39:4.8.22; Deut 26:19), and שׁם ([great] 'name': Gen 41:45; Deut 26:19). It is worth noting that they occur in the same relative sequence in both accounts.

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 39:1-41:46 and Deut 26:5.19 is relatively easy to ascertain. The author of Gen 39:1 evidently omitted from Deut 26:5 all negative references to Israel's ancestors, especially

356 It should be noted that the name of Judah's 'second' firstborn son Perez ('breach': Gen 38:29; cf. 46:12) hardly presents him in a favourable light.

their Aramaic identity and their free-will decision to come to Egypt. Moreover, it is almost evident that the originally isolated idea of being set above all nations (Deut 26:19) was adapted in Gen 39:2-41:46 to the context of coming to the Gentile land of Egypt (Gen 39:1; cf. Deut 26:5).

Accordingly, the story about Joseph as coming to Egypt alone and as being set there above the Gentiles (Gen 39:1-41:46) illustrates the particular ideas of the Deuteronomic texts Deut 26:5.19. However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the larger Deuteronomic section Deut 25:11-28:7 and Gen 39:1-41:46 reveals that the former functioned as a hypotext for the latter.

In particular, the thought that Joseph, who was alone and about to perish (Gen 37:28.36), was brought down to Egypt (Gen 39:1; diff. 37:28.36) originates from Deut 26:5. However, it was reworked in such a way that the Deuteronomic references to the Aramaic identity of Israel's ancestors and to their free-will decision to come to Egypt (Deut 26:5) were omitted in Gen 39:1. In a similar way, the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' slave labour (עבדה) for the Egyptians (מצרי: Deut 26:6) into that of Joseph's ministering (שׁרת) the Egyptian nobleman Potiphar (Gen 39:1-5; cf. 40:4).

The narratively surprising account of Joseph quickly appointed superior over Potiphar's house and all his property (Gen 39:4-6.8) is thematically based on the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as being set above all (presumably Gentile) nations (Deut 26:19; 28:1). The author of Genesis adapted this idea to the context of Joseph's coming to the Gentile land of Egypt (Gen 39:1-41:46). The related idea of Yahweh as blessing (ברך) Potiphar in the house and in the field (בשׂדה) for Joseph's sake (Gen 39:5) was borrowed from Deut 27:12; 28:3-6. Likewise, the idea of Joseph as being great (גדול) in Potiphar's house (Gen 37:9) originated from Deut 26:5.

The account of Joseph being a handsome man (אישׁ) but fearing God (אלהים) and rejecting the advances of his master's wife (אשׁה), who wanted to lie with him (שׁכב עם) and who caught his garment, by running away (יצא) from their Egyptian house (Gen 39:7-19; esp. 39:7-10.12.14-15.19) is based on the literary motif which is well known from Euripides' tragedy *Hippolytus* (esp. 310-1089).[357] This motif was used in Gen 39:7-19 in order to illustrate the Deuteronomic texts which concern a wife catching private parts of a man who is not her husband (Deut 25:11-12), Amalek not fearing God and attacking vulnerable

---

357 For a discussion on other literary motifs and texts which may have been reworked in Gen 39-41, see N. M. Sarna, *Genesis*, 410; V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 472-473, 487-488, 497, 508-509; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 728-729.

Israelites from behind during Israel's going out of Egypt (Deut 25:17-18), as well as not lying with one's mother-in-law (Deut 27:23).[358] In his account, which further presents Joseph's moral superiority over Judah (especially in their sexual relationships: Gen 39:7-12; diff. 38:15-18),[359] the author of Genesis evidently replaced the Deuteronomic character of the mother-in-law with that of the master's wife, most probably in order to make his story narratively coherent and plausible.

The account of Joseph being put into the prison and into the dungeon (Gen 39:20-41:14; esp. 40:15; 41:14) somewhat surprisingly (diff. Gen 39:21-23) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Egyptians treated the Israelites badly and afflicted them in their country (Deut 26:6; cf. also Jer 37:15-16; 38:7-13). On the other hand, the narratively implausible idea that the Israelite Joseph was set above all the Gentile prisoners who were in the Egyptian prison (Gen 39:21-23; 40:4) originates from Deut 26:19; 28:1.

The subsequent account of Joseph's relationship with two officers, the chief cupbearer and the chief baker, of the king of Egypt (Gen 40:1-41:13) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic text which refers to bringing the first fruits of Canaan to Yahweh (Deut 26:1-11; esp. 26:10). By means of these two somewhat strange narrative characters, the author of Genesis alluded to grain and wine, which were regarded as the most important fruits of the land of Canaan (Deut 33:28; cf. 7:13; 8:8; 11:14; 12:17; 14:23; 18:4; 28:51; 29:5; cf. also Gen 14:18; 27:28.37). The positively judged dream of the cupbearer, namely his bringing all the first fruits of a vine to the king (Gen 40:9-13.21), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of bringing the first fruits of Canaan to Yahweh (Deut 26:1-11). On the other hand, the negatively judged dream of the baker, namely his strangely heaping baskets with new bread on his head (Gen 40:16-19.22),[360] negatively alludes to the idea of bringing the first fruits of Canaan to Yahweh in a basket (Deut 26:1-11; esp. 26:2.4; cf. also 21:22). The additional motif of the third (שְׁלִישִׁי) day (Gen 40:20; cf. 40:10.12-13.16.18-19) probably alludes to the re-

---

358 The woman's statements concerning her allegedly crying out with a loud voice (Gen 39:14-15.18) negatively allude to the Deuteronomic text which refers to an engaged woman who should be regarded as guilty because she did not cry in the city while she had a sexual intercourse with another man (Deut 22:23-24).

359 Cf. R. J. Clifford, 'Genesis 38', 528-529; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 666, 725; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 325.

360 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 483; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 750.

lated Deuteronomic instruction concerning giving a tithe in the third year (Deut 26:12). Likewise, the thought that the cupbearer forgot (שכח) the oppressed Joseph (Gen 40:23) negatively illustrates the thought that the Israelites, while paying their tithes, should not forget the Levite, the resident alien, the orphan, and the widow (Deut 26:13).

The subsequent account of Pharaoh's dream and Joseph's wise (חכם) and discerning (בין) interpretation thereof, which was based on the fact that God's Spirit (רוח) dwelt in him (Gen 41:1-39; esp. 41:8.33.38-39),[361] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the divine law, which was regarded as Israel's wisdom and discernment, and which was related to the spirit of wisdom (Deut 26:16-27:26; cf. 4:6; 34:9). Pharaoh was not an Israelite, and for this reason he received a revelation of God's will not through the law but through a dream and through Joseph's priestly-like explanation thereof (Gen 41:1-39; cf. Deut 27:14-26).

The description of Pharaoh as standing (עמד) by the Nile (Gen 41:1.17; cf. 47:3) probably alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelite tribes, having crossed the River Jordan, should stand on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal in order to enact the divine law (Deut 27:12-13). The somewhat surprising temporal reference to the end of two years (Gen 41:1) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of two years which passed between the Israelites' coming to the Jordan and their crossing that river (Deut 1:3; 2:7.14; 8:2.4; 29:4). Moreover, the thought that the following, third year (and the subsequent ones) will be a year of satiation (שׂבע) but also of Pharaoh's collection of one-fifth of the produce of all the land (ארץ) of Egypt (Gen 41:29-31.34-36; cf. 41:47.53) is most probably based on the Deuteronomic thought that the third year is the year of giving a tithe, in which the whole people and the whole land should be satiated because of God's blessing (Deut 26:12.15).

The description of Pharaoh's dream as referring first to cows and than to ears of grain as rising up (עלה: Gen 41:2-7.18-24.26-27) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas of burnt offerings as offered to Yahweh and of peace offerings as eaten before Yahweh (Deut 27:6-7). The motif of first prosperity and then famine (Gen 41:2-7.18-24.26-27) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelite tribes as first blessing and then cursing on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal, beyond the River Jordan (Deut 27:12-13). The thought that the famine will temporarily prevail over prosperity (Gen 41:4.7.20-21.24.30-31) most probably alludes

---

361 Cf. M. V. Fox, 'Wisdom in the Joseph Story', *VT* 51 (2001) 26-41 (esp. 32-33, 36-37).

to the twelve Deuteronomic curses (Deut 27:15-26) as making a greater rhetorical impact than the subsequent six blessings (Deut 28:1-13).

The concluding fragment Gen 41:40-46, which describes Joseph as being set over Pharaoh's house and over all the land of Egypt, illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will be set above all nations (Deut 28:1; cf. 26:19; 28:13). The additional motif of the commanding hand (יד) of the Israelite Joseph (Gen 41:42; cf. 41:44) has probably been borrowed from Deut 28:8. Likewise, the image of calling (קרא) Joseph with extraordinary names (Gen 41:43.45) alludes to Deut 28:10.[362]

Accordingly, in Gen 39:1-41:46 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic legal and hortatory texts concerning, among others, decency in female-male relationships (Deut 25:11-12), shameful attacking weak Israelites (Deut 25:17-19), bringing first fruits and tithes (Deut 26:1-15), coming to Egypt in small number (Deut 26:5), being set above the Gentiles (Deut 26:19; 28:1.13), obeying the divine law beyond the river (Deut 27:1-10), burnt and peace offerings (Deut 27:6-7), as well as blessing and cursing (Deut 27:12-13; cf. 27:15-28:13). The author of Genesis illustrated the main ideas of these Deuteronomic texts with the use of the easily understandable, novelistic story about a complete change in fortune of the young but wise foreigner in the land of Egypt.

2.23 Yahweh blessing his believers, which results in their having full storehouses, being fruitful, and lending to many nations (Gen 41:47-57; cf. Deut 28:8-14)

The idea of Yahweh as blessing his believers, which results in their having full storehouses, being fruitful, and lending to many nations (Gen 41:47-57) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 28:8-14.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 41:47-57 (cf. 41:25-36) and Deut 28:8-12. It is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: טוב ('good' [produce resulting from God's blessing]: Gen 41:26.35; Deut 28:12), ראה ('see' [God's providence and choice]: Gen 41:28.33;

---

362 It should be noted that Joseph's marriage with Asenath (Gen 41:45) did not constitute a violation of the Deuteronomic law Deut 7:3 because Asenath was not a Canaanite (cf. Deut 7:1) but an Egyptian, who could enter the assembly of Yahweh (cf. Deut 23:8-9).

Deut 28:10), ארץ ('land' [blessed by God, foreign]: Gen 41:29-31.33-34.36.46-48.52-57; Deut 28:8.10.12), קרא שׁם ('call [by God's] name': Gen 41:51-52; Deut 28:10), פרה\פרי ('be fruitful / fruit' [resulting from God's blessing]: Gen 41:52; Deut 28:11), עם ([Gentile] 'people': Gen 41:55; cf. 41:40; Deut 28:10), and פתח ('open' [storehouses]: Gen 41:56; Deut 28:12).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 41:47-57 (cf. 41:25-36) and Deut 28:8-12 is quite easy to ascertain. The motif of the fruit of the womb (Deut 28:11) suits its context of Yahweh's blessing regarded as leading to abounding in fruit of everything (Deut 28:11-12), whereas the account of bearing and naming the 'fruitful' Ephraim (Gen 41:52) is very awkwardly inserted into the account of Joseph dealing with the famine in Egypt (Gen 41:47-57; cf. 41:25-36).

Accordingly, the account of Joseph successfully dealing with the famine in Egypt (Gen 41:47-57) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh's blessing leads to abundance of food and to lending to many nations (Deut 28:8-12). In fact, the whole Deuteronomic section Deut 28:8-14, which refers to Yahweh abundantly blessing his faithful believers, may be regarded as a hypotext for the thematically related section Gen 41:47-57.

In particular, the idea of an appointed time of God's blessing for the land (Gen 41:47-48.53; cf. 41:29) was borrowed from Deut 28:12. The related image of Joseph as storing up food beyond measure in the cities (Gen 41:48-49; cf. 41:35)[363] likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as blessing the Israelites in their storehouses (Deut 28:8; cf. 28:12).

The surprisingly introduced account of the birth of Joseph's two sons during the time of agricultural abundance (Gen 41:50-52)[364] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh's blessing results not least in enriching the Israelites with the fruit of their womb (Deut 28:11; cf. 28:4). The somewhat strange idea that Joseph's evidently fully Israelite sons were born of a daughter of an important Egyptian priest (Gen 41:50) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas that the Israelites are a holy people (Deut 28:9) and that they should not serve gods other than Yahweh (Deut 28:14).[365]

---

363 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 265.

364 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 343.

365 Moreover, the idea that the sons of Joseph were born in his marriage with a daughter of an important priest (Gen 41:45.50) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Joseph (and consequently Ephraim) performs a special, quasi-priestly function among the sons of Israel (Deut 33:16; cf. Gen 49:26).

The theocentric explanations of the names of Joseph's two sons (Gen 41:51-52) allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will be called by Yahweh's name among the nations (Deut 28:10). Moreover, especially the name Ephraim, which is explained as related to being unexpectedly fruitful (Gen 41:52),[366] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh's blessing as resulting in the fact that the Israelites will be abundantly granted the fruit of their womb, the fruit of their livestock, and the fruit of their ground (Deut 28:11; cf. 28:4). In order to illustrate this Deuteronomic idea, the author of Genesis described both the land of Egypt and the wife of Joseph as being unexpectedly fruitful (Gen 41:47-52).[367]

The somewhat surprising thought that the land of Egypt was initially spared from the universal famine (Gen 41:54)[368] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that God will bless the Israelites in the land which he is giving them (Deut 28:8; cf. 28:12). Pharaoh's command which was issued to the people of all the land of Egypt, namely that they should go to Joseph and do whatever he says to them (Gen 41:55), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will be the cause of fear, the head, and the top of all the peoples of the earth (Deut 28:10.13).

The description of Joseph as opening his storehouses (Gen 41:56) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of God as opening his storehouses to the Israelites (Deut 28:12). Consequently, the character of Joseph became a narrative embodiment of the features of the invisible God, especially in his indirect revelation to the Gentiles. The related thought that the inhabitants of all lands came to Joseph to buy grain from him (Gen 41:57) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will lend to many nations but will not borrow from them (Deut 28:12).

Accordingly, in Gen 41:47-57 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic ideas concerning Yahweh blessing his faithful believers, so that they could have full storehouses, be a holy people, be fruitful, and lend to many nations (Deut 28:8-14). The author of Genesis narratively illustrated these ideas with the use of the easily understandable story about Joseph as foresightedly storing up grain in the time of good harvests and offering it for sale during the

---

366 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 398; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 268.

367 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 512.

368 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 471-472; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 766.

famine,[369] as well as having children with a daughter of an important Egyptian priest.

2.24 The unfaithful Israelites' cursed coming in and going out (Gen 42; cf. Deut 28:15-22)

The idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed coming in and going out (Gen 42) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 28:15-22.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 42 and Deut 28:18-19. It is provided by two common key words of both texts, namely בוא ('come in' [to the land with no good results]: Gen 42:5-7.9-10.12.15.20.29.34.37; Deut 28:19) and יצא ('go out' [from the land with no good results]: Gen 42:15; cf. 44:4; Deut 28:19).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 42 and Deut 28:18-19 is relatively easy to ascertain. The curses on the land of Canaan and on Israel's coming and going (Deut 28:18-19) suit their execratory context (Deut 28:15-19; cf. also 28:16-68), whereas the account of the bad luck which befell the sons of Israel both at their coming to Egypt (Gen 42:9-24) and at their going out of Egypt (Gen 42:15.25-35; cf. 44:1-17) is somewhat redundant from the narrative point of view.

Accordingly, the account of the Israelites coming to Egypt and going out of there, actions which were only partially successful (Gen 42), illustrates the idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 28:18-19, which threatens the unfaithful Israelites with Yahweh's cursing their land as well as their coming in and going out. However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the longer execratory fragment Deut 28:15-22 and Gen 42 reveals that the former functioned as a hypotext for the latter.

In particular, the introduction to the story about the Israelites' apparent success in buying grain in Egypt (Gen 42) presents them as strangely reluctant to go there (Gen 42:1).[370] Likewise, it states that although Jacob strongly urged his sons to go to Egypt (Gen 42:2), he did not send Benjamin with them because he felt forebodings that some misfortune could befell him (Gen 42:4). In this way,

---

369 For references to similar accounts from Egypt's history, see J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 472; N. M. Sarna, *Genesis*, 290; A. Kunz, 'Ägypten in der Perspektive Israels am Beispiel der Josefsgeschichte (Gen 37-50)', *BZ*, NF 47 (2003) 206-229 (esp. 217-220).

370 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 274-275.

with the use of the reference to the common human belief in the possibility of some misfortune, already in the introduction to Gen 42:5-38 the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic, deeply theological idea that the unfaithful Israelites would be put under a divine curse (Deut 28:15-19). More precisely, the Israelite author of Genesis suggested that Yahweh's curse affected ten tribes (Gen 42:3), but not the 'beloved' tribes of Joseph and Benjamin (Gen 42:4; cf. 35:24), who should therefore be regarded as generally faithful to Yahweh. The subsequent reference to the land of Canaan as struck by the famine (Gen 42:5) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that not only the Israelites but also their land will be cursed if they do not obey Yahweh's voice (Deut 28:15.17-18).

The account of the ten sons of Israel being harshly treated (Gen 42:7; cf. 42:17.30) and falsely accused of being spies (Gen 42:9-17; cf. 42:30.33-34) at their coming to Egypt (Gen 42:5-24) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed coming in (Deut 28:19). The related idea that the sons of Israel will go out of Egypt only when their youngest brother comes there (Gen 42:15) illustrates the related Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed going out (Deut 28:19).

The subsequent account of the preparations for the Israelites' return to Canaan (Gen 42:18-25) narratively illustrates the ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 28:15. At first, Joseph refers to himself as fearing God, and he issues a command that the Israelites should do (עשׂה) what he tells them (Gen 42:18). Joseph's words: 'Do this and you will live' (Gen 42:18) allude to the prophetic-Deuteronomic formula which refers to the reward of life for doing God's will (Deut 4:1; 8:1; cf. Ezek 20:11.13.21 etc.). Consequently, Joseph functions in Gen 42:18-25 as an embodiment of the invisible God.

The Israelites' response to Joseph's words is reluctant but obedient (Gen 42:20). In fact, they agree to leave one of them in the Egyptian prison (cf. Gen 42:19.24). This fact reminds them of their having once left Joseph in the hands of the Ishmaelites (Gen 42:21). However, what is important here is not their recollection but their consideration of the fact that they did not listen (לא שׁמע) to Joseph (and also to their eldest brother Reuben: Gen 42:21-22). The consequence of this not listening to Joseph and Reuben is the distress which came (בוא) upon them (Gen 42:21). In this way, the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic thought that the cursed Israelites did not listen to God, and consequently God's curses came upon them (Deut 28:15).

The narratively redundant remark concerning Joseph as listening to the Israelites and as reacting to their remorse (Gen 42:23-24) in an easily understand-

able way illustrates the idea of Yahweh's omniscience and mercy (cf. Deut 9:19; 10:10 etc.). The subsequent description of Joseph as commanding (צוה) and of the Egyptians as doing (עשׂה) what he commanded (Gen 42:25) presents the Egyptians and not the Israelites as eagerly obeying Joseph's (and consequently God's) will (cf. Deut 28:15). In this way, the author of Genesis suggested that even the Gentiles, through their obedience to wise authorities, may unconsciously obey God's commandments.

The apparently favourable outcome of the Israelites' going out of Egypt, during which money was put at the top of their sacks (Gen 42:25-35; esp. 42:27-28), was in fact unfortunate because it allayed their suspicions during their next visit in Egypt (Gen 44:1-12). In fact, the sons of Israel and their father were afraid when they discovered the money (Gen 42:28.35).[371] Consequently, this account illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed going out (Deut 28:19).

Likewise, the references to the possibility of unhappily bringing also Benjamin to Egypt (Gen 42:34.37-38) allude to the Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed coming in (Deut 28:19). The conclusive image of bringing down Jacob's gray hair with sorrow to Sheol (Gen 42:38) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas of the unfaithful Israelites as being dismayed, and as quickly and unfortunately perishing from the land (Deut 28:20-22).

Accordingly, in Gen 42 the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites' cursed coming in and going out (Deut 28:15-22) with the use of the widely understandable story about vulnerable strangers who came to a dangerous foreign land, and about misfortune which may befall people who are desperately looking for help.

2.25 Being blind at noon and oppressed, longing to see the exiled sons, and being brought to the foreign land of Egypt (Gen 43:1-47:12; cf. Deut 28:23-42)

The ideas of being blind at noon and oppressed, longing to see the exiled sons, and being brought to the foreign land of Egypt (Gen 43:1-47:12) structurally correspond to similar ideas in Deut 28:23-42.

---

371 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 781-783; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 300-301.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 43:1-47:12 and Deut 28:32. It is provided by several common key words of both texts: ראה ('see' [relatives]: Gen 43:16.29; 44:28.31.34; 45:12-13.27-28; 46:29-30; cf. 43:3.5; 44:23.26; Deut 28:32), עין ('eye' [longing to see relatives]: Gen 43:29; 44:21; 45:12; cf. 45:20; 46:4; Deut 28:32), and בן ('son' [given to another people]: Gen 43:29; 45:9-10.28; 46:5.7-27; Deut 28:32).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 43:1-47:12 and Deut 28:32 is relatively easy to ascertain. The curse concerning sons given to another people (Deut 28:32) suits its execratory context (Deut 28:15-68), whereas the account of longing to see the relative who remained in Egypt (Gen 43:1-47:12) is rather unnecessarily complicated and redundant from the narrative point of view.

Accordingly, the story about Israel's sons as coming to Egypt and about Israel as longing to see them (Gen 43:1-47:12) is based on the Deuteronomic text Deut 28:32. However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the longer section Deut 28:23-42 and Gen 43:1-47:12 reveals that the former functioned as a structurizing, sequentially used hypotext for the latter.

In particular, the initial statement that the famine became severe in the land (Gen 43:1-2; diff. 42:5) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will cause severe drought in Canaan (Deut 28:23-24). The subsequent idea of seeing the face (פני) of the Israelites' powerful oppressor in Egypt (Gen 43:3-7)[372] illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of the unfaithful Israelites as being defeated before (לפני) their enemies (Deut 28:25).

Judah's hasty proposal, which reveals his recklessness and his lack of real care for the life of Benjamin (Gen 43:3-5.8-10; cf. 44:16.30-34), like earlier for that of Joseph (Gen 37:26-27), presents Judah as lacking Israel's faith (diff. Gen 43:11-14)[373] and as being at least partially responsible for the downfall of the neighbouring tribe of Benjamin (cf. also Judg 20:18).

The description of the unfaithful Israelites as going down to Egypt (Gen 43:15) alludes to the motif of Egypt in Deut 28:27. The subsequent idea of the Israelites as not recognizing Joseph during a special noon (צהרים) meal (Gen 43:16-34; esp. 43:16.25), notwithstanding evident hints about his identity (Gen 43:29-30.33-34),[374] illustrates the Deuteronomic curse concerning being blind at

---

372 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 355.

373 The idea of Judah's haste to go down to Egypt (Gen 43:8.10; cf. 44:14.16; 46:28) seems to allude also to Jer 41:16-44:30.

374 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 357-358.

noon (Deut 28:28-29). The subsequent, related but narratively redundant ideas of being brought to Joseph's house (בית: Gen 43:16-19.24.26)[375] and of slaughtering (טבח) an animal for the meal (Gen 43:16) negatively allude to the subsequent Deuteronomic curses concerning not dwelling in one's own house (Deut 28:30) and not eating one's own slaughtered ox (Deut 28:31).[376] Likewise, the narratively redundant remark concerning the possibility that also the Israelites' donkeys (חמור) will be taken from them (Gen 43:18; diff. 43:24)[377] alludes to the thematically corresponding Deuteronomic curse Deut 28:31 (cf. 28:29). Accordingly, the Israelite author of Genesis presented other tribes, but not that of Joseph, as being put under the Deuteronomic curses.

In a similar way, the author of Genesis suggested that although Joseph's eyes once longed to see young Benjamin (cf. Gen 44:21), who was his mother's son but also, in a certain way, functioned as his own son (cf. Deut 28:32), now his desire was satisfied (Gen 43:29-31.34; cf. 45:12). Likewise, the account of Joseph eating (אכל) abundantly (Gen 43:32.34) negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic curse Deut 28:33. The narratively strange description of the Hebrews and the Egyptians as eating in separated groups (Gen 43:32; cf. 43:34)[378] illustrates the Deuteronomic dietary rules, which separate the Israelites from other peoples by presenting some meals as an abomination (Deut 14:2-21). The author of Genesis explained these Israelite reservations as in fact caused by the haughty Egyptians, to whom it is an abomination (תועבה) to eat (אכל) with the Hebrews (Gen 43:32).[379]

The subsequent account of the unfaithful Israelites being oppressed, crushed, and forced to become slaves (Gen 44:1-17; esp. 44:16) illustrates the thematically related Deuteronomic curse Deut 28:33. Likewise, the subsequent, narratively redundant, Judah's account of his father's grief as caused by longing to see (ראה) his beloved son, and also of Judah's own grief as caused by seeing his father's evil (רע: Gen 44:34; cf. Deut 28:35) fate (Gen 44:18-34; esp.

375 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 336.

376 It is possible that also the idea of drinking wine (Gen 43:34) negatively alludes to Deut 28:30.

377 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 356.

378 Cf. R. R. Reno, *Genesis*, 278.

379 The Egyptians likewise had their own religiously motivated dietary rules, e.g. that of not eating cows: see Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.18, 41-42, 46. Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 791.

44:22.28-31.34)[380] alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic curse Deut 28:34 (cf. 28:32). Besides, Joseph's command to pursue (רדף) the Israelites (Gen 44:4) narratively illustrates the thematically related Deuteronomic curses Deut 28:22.45. Similarly, the idea of the Egyptian steward as overtaking (נשׂג) the Israelites (Gen 44:4.6) illustrates the Deuteronomic curses Deut 28:15.45.

The subsequent account (Gen 45) introduces the idea of Israel and his sons as coming to Egypt (Gen 46:1-30; cf. Deut 28:32.41).[381] The long list of Israel's begotten (ילד) sons and grandsons who came to Egypt (Gen 46:8-25; cf. 46:7) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites' begotten sons will be taken into captivity (Deut 28:41; cf. 28:32). The conclusive thought that all the persons of the house of Jacob who came into Egypt were seventy (Gen 46:27) originates from the Deuteronomic text Deut 10:22 (cf. also Gen 10:1-32 and Deut 32:8). The description of Joseph and Israel as finally seeing each other after a very long time (Gen 46:29-30) suggests that the Deuteronomic curse concerning the Israelites as longing to see their sons (Deut 28:32) came to an end.

The somewhat strange idea that the Egyptians regard all shepherds as an abomination (Gen 46:34; cf. 46:32-33; 47:3-4)[382] in an easily understandable way illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas that the Israelites will be regarded as horrific among all the peoples where Yahweh will lead them (Deut 28:37) and that the Israelites should regard unclean objects as an abomination (תועבה: Deut 14:2-21; cf. also Gen 43:32).

The surprising description of Jacob's encounter with Pharaoh (Gen 47:7-10)[383] narratively presents Jacob as a respectable old man who resembled an exiled priest or king, and thus it alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelite kings will be brought to a foreign nation (Deut 28:36). The conclusive statements concerning the Israelites as dwelling in the best part of the land of Egypt and concerning Joseph as somewhat surprisingly providing them with food there (Gen 47:11-12; cf. 47:6)[384] negatively allude to the Deuteronomic

---

380 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 804-806.

381 The author of Genesis probably alluded in Gen 45:5.7 to the fact that the Israelites were exiled to Assyria long before the Judaeans were exiled to Babylonia, and consequently the Israelites could help the 'remnant' of the Judaeans to survive there (cf. Is 10:20-22; 11:11-13.16 etc.).

382 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 472.

383 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 846; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 479; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 370-371.

384 Cf. J.-D. Döhling, 'Herrschaft', 18-19.

curses Deut 28:38-42. Moreover, the use of the name of the great Egyptian builder Ramses in Gen 47:11 (diff. 47:6.27 etc.: Goshen) may allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites in the exile will serve gods of stone (Deut 28:36).

Accordingly, in Gen 43:1-47:12 the author of Genesis sequentially illustrated the Deuteronomic ideas which are contained in Deut 28:23-42, especially those of being blind at noon, being oppressed, longing to see the exiled sons, and being brought to a foreign land. He did it in an easily understandable, novelistic way, with the use of several traditional motifs, for example that of the Egyptians' haughtiness towards other, especially nomadic nations and social classes (cf. e.g. Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.41, 47).[385]

2.26 Plague of a very severe famine in the land of Egypt, a residing alien rising to power, being removed from the land, and becoming slaves (Gen 47:13-26; cf. Deut 28:43-29:28)

The motifs of the plague of a very severe famine in the land of Egypt, borrowing from a residing alien who rose to power, being removed from the land, and becoming slaves (Gen 47:13-26) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 28:43-29:28.

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 47:13-26 and Deut 28:43-44.48.51.59-61.63-64.68. It is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: רעב ('famine' [in the land of God's providence]: Gen 47:13.20; Deut 28:48), מצרים ([plagues of] 'Egypt': Gen 47:13-15.20-21.26; Deut 28:60), צאן ('flock' [not left to the inhabitants of the land]: Gen 47:17; Deut 28:51), בהמה ('livestock' [taken by the foreigner]: Gen 47:18; Deut 28:51), שׁאר ('leave' [nothing to the inhabitants of the land]: Gen 47:18; Deut 28:51.55), אדמה ('land' [of destruction]: Gen 47:18-20.22-23.26; Deut 28:51.63), קנה ('buy' [people as their enemy]: Gen 47:19-20.22-23; Deut 28:68), עבד ('slave' [of necessity]: Gen 47:19.25; Deut 28:68), מכר ('sell' [of necessity]: Gen 47:20.22; Deut 28:68), and מקצה ועד־קצה ('from one end [of the land] to the other': Gen 47:21; Deut 28:64).

---

385 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 496; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 791.

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 47:13-26 and Deut 28:43-44.48.51.59-61.63-64.68 is quite easy to ascertain. The curses uttered in Deut 28:43-44.48.51.59-61.63-64.68 suit their execratory context (Deut 28:15-68), whereas the account of the famine in Egypt and of the Egyptians becoming slaves (Gen 47:13-26) is very awkwardly inserted into the account of the settlement of Joseph's family in the land of Goshen (Gen 46:28-47:27).[386]

Accordingly, the account of the plague of a very severe famine in the land of Egypt, the Egyptians buying from a residing alien who rose to power, their being removed from their land, and their becoming slaves (Gen 47:13-26) is based on the motifs which were borrowed from Deut 28:43-44.48.51.59-61.63-64.68. Moreover, a detailed intertextual analysis of the whole execratory section Deut 28:43-29:28 and Gen 47:13-26 reveals that the former may be regarded as a hypotext of the latter.

In particular, the thought that the famine was very severe both in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan (Gen 47:13-15; cf. 43:1; 47:4.20) originates from the Deuteronomic motifs of the plagues of the land of Egypt which will strike the Israelites (Deut 28:60; cf. 29:2.21) and of the famine as one of these plagues (Deut 28:48). The image of the Egyptians as having much silver (כסף: Gen 47:14; cf. 47:15-16.18) may allude to the Deuteronomic image of the land of the Israelites' exile as full of pagan idols made of silver and gold (Deut 29:16). The thought that the Egyptians were about to die before (נגד) Joseph (Gen 47:15) may allude to the Deuteronomic curse of the sinful people's life as hanging in doubt before them (Deut 28:66).

The idea that all the Egyptians' flocks, donkeys (חמר), and livestock were not left to them but taken from them by the foreigner Joseph (Gen 47:17-18) illustrates the thematically related Deuteronomic curses Deut 28:31.51.55. The thought that even the land of the Egyptians was taken from them (Gen 47:18-20.23.26; cf. 47:22) illustrates the Deuteronomic curses Deut 28:63; 29:27 (cf. 28:51). The correlated ideas that the Egyptians were bought by their 'enemy' Joseph (Gen 47:19-20.23; cf. 47:22), that they of necessity became slaves of the Pharaoh (Gen 47:19.25; cf. 47:21), and that they of necessity sold their property

---

386 Cf. G. W. Coats, *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (FOTL 1; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1983), 299-300; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 371. Cf. also Y.-W. Fung, *Victim and Victimizer: Joseph's Interpretation of his Destiny* (JSOTSup 308; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 2000), 36-38.

to Pharaoh (Gen 47:20; cf. 47:22)[387] illustrate the Deuteronomic curse Deut 28:68.

The motif of moving the population from one end of the land to the other (Gen 47:21) was borrowed from Deut 28:64. In fact, the use of this motif in Gen 47:21, as referring to moving the people of Egypt to the cities, is quite strange in the context of the Egyptians' resolve to cultivate the land (Gen 47:19; cf. 47:23-24).[388] On the other hand, the surprising thought that in the time of drought the Egyptians bought seed and sowed (זרע) the land (Gen 47:23-24; cf. 47:19)[389] most probably negatively alludes to the Deuteronomic images of the land as irrigated (Deut 29:18) and sowed (Deut 29:22). The exemption of the fields of Egyptian priests from taxation (Gen 47:22.26) is confirmed in the Persian period (Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.168).[390]

The thought that entire households, including those who were in them (אשר ב) and little children (טף), were saved (Gen 47:24) alludes to the contents of Deut 29:9-10. The concluding idea that Joseph's statute concerning the land of Egypt stands to (עד) this day (Gen 47:26) illustrates the likewise concluding Deuteronomic idea that the words of God's law should be observed forever (Deut 29:28). The author of Genesis reworked this Israelite hortatory-theological idea into a purely legal one, once more presenting Joseph as the one who reveals and enacts God's will in the world.

Accordingly, in Gen 47:13-26 the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic covenantal curses and exhortations Deut 28:43-29:28. He did it in a widely understandable way, with the use of the story about far-reaching economic and social consequences of a very severe famine which once stroke the land of Egypt.

---

387 Such practices during famine are known from ancient Mesopotamia: see K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 849-850; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 371.

388 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 449; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 494; L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 4, 398.

389 *Pace* K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 858-859 who surprisingly states, 'Seeding the ground in the time of famine would possibly delay the total erosion of the land […]'.

390 Cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 501.

2.27 Multiplication and long life in the land of God's providence, and a future return to Canaan (Gen 47:27-31; cf. Deut 30:1-31:2)

The motif of blessing which leads to multiplication, long life, and return (Gen 47:27-31) structurally corresponds to a similar motif in Deut 30:1-31:2.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 47:27-31 and Deut 30:1-31:2 is provided by several common key words of both texts: ישב ('dwell' [in the land of God's providence]: Gen 47:27; Deut 30:20), רבה ('multiply' [as a result of God's blessing]: Gen 47:27; Deut 30:5.16), חיה ('live' [as a result of God's blessing]: Gen 47:28; Deut 30:16.19), שׁנה ('year' [of life]: Gen 47:28; Deut 31:2), ימים ('days' [of long life]: Gen 47:28; Deut 30:18.20), חי ('life' [as a result of God's blessing]: Gen 47:28; Deut 30:6.15.19-20), מאה ('one hundred' [years of life]: Gen 47:28; Deut 31:2), and בן ('son' [returning to Canaan]: Gen 47:29; Deut 30:2).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 47:27-31 and Deut 30:1-31:2 is relatively easy to ascertain. The motif of blessing of multiplication, long life, and return (Deut 30:1-31:2) suits its context of conclusive blessings and curses (Deut 29-30), whereas the account of Jacob's instructions concerning his burial (Gen 47:29-31; cf. 49:29-32) is quite surprisingly placed before the prolonged account of his blessing his sons (Gen 48:1-49:28), and it redundantly anticipates the subsequent instructions Gen 49:29-32.

Accordingly, the account of Israel's multiplication, long life in Egypt, and a future return to Canaan (Gen 47:27-31) is thematically based on the motifs which were borrowed from Deut 30:1-31:2.

In particular, the motif of Israel safely dwelling in Egypt, in the borderland of Goshen, which could be regarded as the land of God's providence for them (Gen 47:27), alludes to the motif of Israel safely dwelling in the land of Canaan (Deut 30:20). The related idea of the Israelites as exceedingly multiplying in the land of Goshen, in the aftermath of their conversion and as a result of God's blessing for them (Gen 47:27; cf. 45:1-47:12),[391] illustrates the similar Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites multiplying in the land of Canaan (Deut 30:5.16).

The idea of Jacob as living long in Egypt (Gen 47:28) illustrates the similar idea of Israel as living long in Canaan (Deut 30:16.19). The related, somewhat strangely formulated reference to the days of Jacob, that is the years of his life

391 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 372.

(Gen 47:28; cf. 47:29), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of numerous days of long life as a result of God's blessing (Deut 30:6.15.19-20; cf. 30:18). The number of the years of Jacob's life, namely one hundred and forty-seven (Gen 47:28), alludes to the number of the years of Moses' life, that is one hundred and twenty (Deut 31:2). The author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic idea of a perfect number (120) of years of Moses' life by giving the number 147 (3 × 49),[392] which better suited the relatively late, sacred calculation of time, a calculation which was based on the economically more realistic idea of counting jubilees of 49 (and not 7) years for enacting the Deuteronomy-based law concerning remitting debts (Lev 25:8-55; 27:17-24; Num 36:4; diff. Deut 15:1-18).

The somewhat strange idea of Israel and his son's future return to Canaan (Gen 47:29-31) illustrates the idea which was borrowed from Deut 30:2-3. The author of Genesis reworked this particularly Israelite, prophetic-Deuteronomic idea with the use of the widely understandable (although hardly realistic) image of the son burying the body of his deceased father not in a foreign land but in the common grave with his relatives.[393] Moreover, the author of Genesis presented Joseph, Israel's most beloved and most faithful son (and not, for example, Reuben or Judah), as most suitable for fulfilling this task and therefore worthy of being treated with special deference (Gen 47:29.31; cf. 37:9-11; 49:26).[394] The related idea of Joseph as obediently doing (עשׂה) according to the word (דבר) of his father (Gen 47:30; cf. 47:31) in a similar way illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as obediently doing God's word (Deut 30:14).

Accordingly, in Gen 47:27-31 the author of Genesis illustrated the Deuteronomic ideas which are contained in Deut 30:1-31:2, especially those of the Israelites' future return to Canaan, multiplication, and long life in the aftermath of their conversion to Yahweh and obedience to God's word. The author of Genesis illustrated these highly theological ideas in an easily understandable way, with the use of the images of the Israelites' multiplication in the fertile land of

---

392 For the use of the symbolic numbers of seven, twelve, ten, and their multiples in ancient Near Eastern texts, see R. Zadok, 'Neo-Assyrian Notes', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Near East*, Festschrift I. Eph'al (Hebrew University Magness: Jerusalem 2008), 312-330 (esp. 313-319).

393 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 518.

394 Cf. R. de Hoop, '"Then Israel Bowed Himself..." (Genesis 47.31)', *JSOT* 28.4 (2004) 467-480 (esp. 479-480); K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 862-863; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 517.

Egypt and of the most beloved son as promising to fulfil the last will of his father, whose number of the years of life was perfect and who wanted to be buried together with his relatives.

2.28 Israel's succession in the particularly chosen tribe of Ephraim (Gen 48; cf. Deut 31:2-32:52)

The idea of Israel's succession in the particularly chosen tribe of Ephraim (Gen 48) structurally corresponds to a similar idea in Deut 31:2-32:52 (cf. Josh 19:49-50; 24:29-30).

Linguistic correspondence may be traced mainly between Gen 48 and Deut 31:2-23. It is provided by several common key words and phrases of both texts: בן ('son' [as a heir]: Gen 48:1-2.5.8-9.19; Deut 31:13), ארץ ([promised] 'land': Gen 48:3-4.7.16.21; Deut 31:7.16.21.23), זרע ('offspring' [as heirs]: Gen 48:4.11.19; Deut 31:21), לא יכל ('not to be able' [because of old age]: Gen 48:10; Deut 31:2), מות ('die' [soon]: Gen 48:21; Deut 31:14), and האמרי ('the Amorites' [conquered]: Gen 48:22; Deut 31:4).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 48 and Deut 31:2-23 is relatively easy to ascertain. The idea of succession in Ephraim (Deut 31:2-23) suits its context of conclusive instructions and predictions (Deut 31-32), whereas the account of Jacob giving a special blessing for Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 48) is quite surprising as preceding the account of Jacob blessing all his sons (Gen 49).

Accordingly, the story about Israel as constituting the line of succession to him in the particularly chosen character of Ephraim (Gen 48) illustrates the main idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 31:2-23, which describes Moses as being given succession in Joshua, who belonged to the tribe of Ephraim (cf. Josh 19:49-50; 24:29-30; Judg 2:8-9).[395] However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the larger section Deut 31:2-32:52 and Gen 48 suggests that the former functioned as a hypotext for the latter.

In particular, the idea of Joseph as taking his sons with him so that they could hear the words of their grandfather (whom they previously did not know: cf. Gen 48:8) and become his heirs (Gen 48:1.5-6) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that also the Israelites' grandsons should hear the words of God's law and

---

395 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 770; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 177.

become heirs of Yahweh's covenant with Israel (Deut 31:13; cf. 31:12). The reference to Jacob as seeing (ראה) the land of Canaan (ארץ כנען) now from a distant point (Gen 48:3) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Moses as seeing the land of Canaan from the distant Mount Nebo (Deut 32:49). The somewhat imprecisely recalled motif of Yahweh promising to Jacob at Luz in the land of Canaan that he will become an assembly of peoples (קהל עמים: Gen 48:4; cf. 28:3; diff. 35:11)[396] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of assembling the whole people of Israel (Deut 31:12; cf. 31:28.30). Likewise, the imprecisely recalled motif of Yahweh giving the land of Canaan to Jacob's descendants as their everlasting possession (אחזה: Gen 48:4; cf. 17:8; diff. 35:12)[397] was in fact borrowed from Deut 32:49. On the other hand, the somewhat strange idea of Joseph's future sons as being put under the authority of Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48:6)[398] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites' more remote grandsons will be put under the guidance of the more chosen children (Deut 31:13). The evidently artificial justification of regarding Ephraim as Jacob's firstborn son, namely because of the proximity of his name to that of the burial place of Jacob's beloved wife Rachel, who died (מות) on his way to Ephrath (Gen 48:7),[399] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Moses as burying his relative Aaron on his way to Canaan (Deut 32:50). Accordingly, the whole introductory part of the account (Gen 48:1-7) is in fact based on the motifs which were borrowed from Deut 31:12-13 and Deut 32:49-50. The author of Genesis reworked these motifs in a quite surprising way in order to present Ephraim as Jacob's firstborn son who effectively replaced Reuben (Gen 48:5.7).[400]

The idea of Jacob as blessing the sons of Joseph (Gen 48:9) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Moses as blessing the sons of Israel (Deut 33:1). The image of Jacob as being old (זקן: Gen 48:10) alludes to the idea of the elders of Israel as depositaries of God's law (Deut 31:9.28; 32:7). The related idea of old

---

396 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 460-461, 463.

397 Cf. ibid. 463; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 874.

398 Cf. R. R. Reno, *Genesis*, 286.

399 Cf. F. Giuntoli, *L'officina della tradizione: Studio di alcuni interventi redazionali post-sacerdotali e del loro contesto nel ciclo di Giacobbe (Gn 25,19 – 50,26)* (AnBib 154; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2003), 255-256; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 536-537.

400 Cf. T. D. Alexander, 'The Regal Dimensions of the תולדות־יעקב: Recovering the Literary Context of Genesis 37-50', in J. G. McConville and K. Möller (eds.), *Reading the Law*, Festschrift G. J. Wenham (LHBOTS 461; T&T Clark: New York · London 2007), 196-212 (esp. 204-206).

Jacob as not being able to see (Gen 48:10) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of old Moses as not being able to go out and come in (Deut 31:2). The idea of Joseph and his offspring as being confronted with Jacob mouth to mouth and face to face (פנה: Gen 48:10-11) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the faces and mouths of the Israelites' offspring as being confronted with the song of Moses (Deut 31:21).

The strange description of Joseph as bowing down with his face to the earth and taking (לקח) his two sons with his right hand and with his left hand, and thus approaching Jacob (Gen 48:12-13),[401] illustrates the Deuteronomic image of Yahweh as an eagle which spreads out its wings, takes its young, and carries them on its pinions (Deut 32:11). Consequently, the author of Genesis once more presented Joseph as an embodiment of the features and attitudes of Yahweh. Moreover, he again presented Ephraim as being treated as Jacob's firstborn son (Gen 48:14; cf. 48:5.17-20; cf. also Deut 33:16-17).

The idea of Israel as blessing (ברך) Joseph (Gen 48:15) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as blessing Joseph (Deut 33:13). This time, the author of Genesis did not want to present Jacob simply as a narrative embodiment of the features Yahweh. The author of Genesis described Israel's blessing for Joseph in order to highlight the special position of Ephraim (and Manasseh) among the tribes of Israel.

The idea that Israel's fathers (אב) were examples of faith (Gen 48:15-16) originates from Deut 32:7. The thought that God was Jacob's shepherd, angel, and redeemer all his life to this day (Gen 48:15-16) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh was Israel's creator, protector, educator, judge, and redeemer throughout its history (Deut 32:4-43). Likewise, the motif of invoking (קרא) the name (שׁם) of Jacob and his forefathers (Gen 48:16)[402] alludes to the introduction to the song of Moses (Deut 32:3). The idea of Joseph's sons as growing into a multitude in the midst (בקרב) of the land (הארץ) of the exile (Gen 48:16) most probably alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as being in the midst of the land of their exile (Deut 31:16).

The idea of Ephraim as being treated as the firstborn (בכר: Gen 48:18) alludes to Moses blessing Joseph as the firstborn bull (Deut 33:17; cf. also Jer 31:9). Likewise, the idea of Ephraim's offspring as becoming the fullness (מלא) of nations (Gen 48:19)[403] alludes to Moses' blessing that Joseph should receive

---

401 Cf. J.-D. Döhling, 'Herrschaft', 23-25; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 545-546.

402 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 554.

403 Cf. ibid. 557.

the fullness of the earth (Deut 33:16). Similarly, the idea of blessing (ברך) Joseph's sons in a special way among the sons of Israel (Gen 48:20) alludes to Moses' special blessing for Joseph (Deut 33:13; cf. 33:14-17).

The idea of Jacob as saying that behold (הנה), he will soon die (Gen 48:21) alludes to the similar Deuteronomic idea of Moses as being told that behold, the days approach when he must die (Deut 31:14). The subsequent idea of a future return of Israel's children to the land of Canaan (Gen 48:21) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that a future generation of the Israelites will return to the land of Canaan (Deut 31:21.23).

The reference to Jacob as giving to Joseph one (אחד) portion of land more than to his brothers (Gen 48:22; cf. 48:16.19) is based on Ezekiel's idea that both Manasseh and Ephraim should be given one portion of land (Ezek 48:4-5), and on the Deuteronomic idea that the borders of the peoples are fixed according to the number of the sons of Israel (Deut 32:8). The author of Genesis alluded to these ideas with the use of a reference to Shechem (שׁכם), which was located in the centre of Canaan (cf. Josh 20:7; 24:1.25) and regarded as an extra portion that was given to the particularly favoured son (Gen 48:22; cf. Josh 24:32), thus presenting Joseph as enjoying the privilege of Israel's firstborn son.[404] The conclusive, narratively surprising reference to Jacob as having once conquered the Amorites with his sword and his bow (Gen 48:22)[405] in fact alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites once conquered the land of the Amorites (Deut 31:4).

Accordingly, in Gen 48 the author of Genesis narratively illustrated the Deuteronomic ideas which are contained in Deut 31:2-32:52, especially those of Moses as being given succession in Joshua, who belonged to the tribe of Ephraim (cf. Josh 19:49-50; 24:29-30), and of the future generation of the Israelites as becoming heirs of Yahweh's covenant with Israel. The author of Genesis did it in a widely understandable way, with the use of the motif of an old man blessing his favoured son and his particularly chosen grandson.

---

404 Cf. A. Rofé, 'Clan Sagas As a Source in Settlement Traditions', in S. M. Olyan and R. C. Culley (eds.), *"A Wise and Discerning Mind"*, Festschrift B. O. Long (BJS 325; Brown University: Providence, RI 2000), 191-203 (esp. 192); P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 177-178.

405 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 561-562; L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 4, 439.

2.29 Blessings for the sons and tribes of Israel (Gen 49:1-28; cf. Deut 33)

The motif of blessings for the sons and tribes of Israel (Gen 49:1-28) structurally corresponds to a similar motif in Deut 33.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 49:1-28 and Deut 33 is provided by the key phrases תהום רבצת תחת ('primeval ocean': Gen 49:25; Deut 33:13), גבעת\גבעות עולם ('everlasting hills': Gen 49:26; Deut 33:15; cf. also Hab 3:6), and לראשׁ יוסף ולקדקד נזיר אחיו ('on the head of Joseph, on the skull of the one consecrated among his brothers': Gen 49:26; Deut 33:16), which refer to Joseph and which (with one exception for גבעת\גבעות עולם) are distinctive of both texts in the Bible. Moreover, this correspondence is provided by numerous other common key words and phrases: בן ('son' [of Israel]: Gen 49:1-2.8-9.33; Deut 33:1.24), אסף ('gather' [sons of Israel]: Gen 49:1; Deut 33:5), ישׂראל ([all] 'Israel': Gen 49:2.7.16.24.28; Deut 33:1.5.10.21.28-29), בוא ('come' [of Judah]: Gen 49:10; Deut 33:7), ימים ('seas' [of Zebulun]: Gen 49:13; Deut 33:19), שׁבטי ישׂראל ('tribes of Israel': Gen 49:16.28; Deut 33:5), שׁמן ('fat' [of Asher]: Gen 49:20; Deut 33:24), ברך ('bless' [the sons of Israel]: Gen 49:25.28; Deut 33:1.11.13.20.24), ברכה ('blessing' [for the sons of Israel]: Gen 49:25-26.28; Deut 33:1.23), and שׁמים ('heaven' [as a source of blessing]: Gen 49:25; Deut 33:13.26.28).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 49:1-28 and Deut 33 is relatively easy to ascertain.[406] The surprisingly combined blessing for Simeon and Levi (Gen 49:5)[407] refers to the account of their vengeance at Shechem (Gen 34:25-31),[408] an account which originates from a hypertextual reworking of Deut 20:10-22:29.[409] Moreover, the extended introduction and conclusion of the blessings (Deut 33:2-5.26-29), which suit their salvation-

---

406 Cf. J. Van Seters, 'The Religion of the Patriarchs in Genesis', *Bib* 61 (1980) 220-233 (esp. 226).

407 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 473.

408 This fact was not taken into due consideration by U. Szwarc, *Przesłanie Rdz 49 i Pwt 33: Studium literacko-egzegetyczno-historyczne* (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski: Lublin 1997), 90-94, 225, 246-247, 263. Cf., however, ibid. 55-56.

409 See above, 125-131 (Section 2.18).

history context (Deut 32-33), were evidently simplified in Gen 49:1-2.28 to suit their new context of the account of Jacob's last words (Gen 48-49).[410]

Accordingly, the conclusive blessings which were given by Israel to his twelve sons (or tribes) before his death (Gen 49:1-28) originate from Moses' conclusive blessing for the sons/tribes of Israel (Deut 33). The author of Genesis thoroughly reworked this Deuteronomic text, not least by adapting it to the context of Jacob's last words (cf. Gen 48) and by reworking the Deuteronomic south-east to north-west order of the tribes (Deut 33:6-25; cf. 33:2; diff. Ezek 48:1-29; cf. 48:31-34)[411] into a more complex one, in which Israel's central tribes of Joseph and Benjamin, which presumably constituted the core of the postexilic population of the province of Samaria, were place at the end (Gen 49:22-27) in order to highlight their special position in Israel (cf. Gen 30:22; 35:16-18 etc.). Moreover, the blessings in Gen 49:3-27, in difference to those of Deut 33:6-25 but in line with the etymological interest of the author of Genesis (cf. Gen 29:32-30:24; 35:16-18), are at least partly based on the linguistic features of the respective names (esp. Gen 49:3.8.16.19.22).[412]

The introductory idea of gathering the sons of Jacob/Israel (Gen 49:1-2; cf. 49:33) was borrowed from Deut 33:4-5 (cf. also Josh 24:1). The idea of their father (אב) as telling (נגד) them what will happen to them in future days (Gen 49:1-2) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelite fathers as informing their children about the days of eternity and the years of many generations (Deut 32:7). The author of Genesis reworked this particularly Israelite idea in an easily understandable way, with the use of the motif of an old man predicting the future of his children before his death.

The blessing for Reuben (Gen 49:3-4) refers to the immoral behaviour of this character, as it was described in Gen 35:22.[413] Likewise, the combined blessing for Simeon and Levi (Gen 49:5-7) refers to the account of their punish-

---

410 For this reason, the argument of R. de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 1998), 535 n. 333 that an omission of 'blessings by Yahweh' from Deut 33:13a in Gen 49:22 seems very improbable because Gen 49, in comparison to Deut 33, is intended to be more like a blessing, is in fact unconvincing.

411 Cf. R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 387.

412 Cf. K. Schöpflin, 'Jakob segnet seinen Sohn: Genesis 49,1-28 im Kontext von Josefs- und Vätergeschichte', *ZAW* 115 (2003) 501-523 (esp. 519-520); K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 871, 891, 899, 901, 903; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 381-382.

413 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 584-585.

able, bloody vengeance at Shechem (Gen 34:25-31).[414] In this way, by disqualifying Reuben, Simeon, and Levi as potential leaders of Israel, the author of Genesis set the stage for the partially positive presentation of Judah.[415] The statement that Yahweh will divide (חלק) and scatter Simeon and Levi in Israel (Gen 49:7) alludes to the absence of Simeon in the Deuteronomic blessings for the tribes of Israel (Deut 33:6-25; diff. Ezek 48:24) and to the thought that the tribe of Levi has no portion (חלק) in Israel (Deut 10:9 etc.).

The elaborate blessing for Judah (Gen 49:8-12), which is to some extent based on the Deuteronomic blessing for Gad (Deut 33:20-21: לביא, טרף, מחקק, עם almost in the same sequence) and on the subsequent blessing for Dan (Deut 33:22: גור אריה), recognizes Judah's authority among the Israelites (Gen 49:8)[416] and among other peoples (Gen 49:10).[417] However, this authority is limited in at least two ways. First, Judah should exercise his authority in a temporarily limited way,[418] until he comes to Shiloh (שׁילה: Gen 49:10; cf. 1 Sam 4:12), a central-Israelite city in the territory of Ephraim (cf. שׁלה / שׁלו / שׁילו: Josh 18:1-19:51; 22:12; Judg 21:12.19.21 etc.),[419] which should be interpreted as an allusion to the Deuteronomic blessing that Judah, regarded by the Israelites as a separatist,[420] should be brought (בוא) to his people, that is to the rest of the tribes (שׁבט) of Israel (Deut 33:7; cf. 33:5). Second, in line with Ezekiel-based ideas of Deuteronomy, secular power should be subordinated to priestly authority (Deut

---

414 Cf. R. de Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 521; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 886-889; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 379-380.

415 Cf. K. Sparks, 'Genesis 49 and the Tribal List Tradition in Ancient Israel', *ZAW* 115 (2003) 327-347 (esp. 330-334, 343); K. Schöpflin, 'Jakob', 518; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 379-381.

416 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 657-658; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 890; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 381.

417 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 478; K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 890, 896.

418 Cf. J.-D. Döhling, 'Herrschaft', 26-27.

419 Cf. É. Nodet, *Samaritains, Juifs, Temples* (CahRB 74; J. Gabalda: Pendé 2010), 72-74. With the use of the image of Judah as an aggressive lion (Gen 49:8-9; cf. Ezek 19:1-9) and then of his coming to Shiloh (Gen 49:10; cf. Deut 33:7), the author of Genesis probably suggested that Judah should abandon its aggressive policy against its Israelite neighbours Benjamin and Ephraim (cf. Judg 20:18; 2 Kgs 23:15-16), join the postexilic community ('vine': Gen 49:11; cf. Ezek 19:10-11) of Israel, purify itself (Gen 49:11; cf. Exod 19:10 etc.), and share the joy of unity (Gen 49:12).

420 Cf. K. Sparks, 'Genesis 49', 328; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 389; É. Nodet, *Samaritains*, 75.

17:18-20), and in the perspective of Genesis this authority is represented by the unique altar of burnt offerings in the Ephraimite region of Shechem (Gen 12:6-7; 22:1-19; 33:18-20), as well as the old Ephraimite-Benjaminite sanctuary at Bethel (Gen 12:8; 13:3-4; 28:10-22; 31:13; 35:1-15).[421] In fact, it is Joseph who is praised as the one consecrated (נזיר) among his brothers (Gen 49:26; cf. Deut 33:16; cf. also Exod 29:6; 39:30 etc.).[422]

The blessing for Zebulun (Gen 49:13) is a reworked version of Deut 33:18-19 with its idea of trade over the seas. Likewise, the blessing for Asher (Gen 49:20) is based on Deut 33:24 with its reference to oil/fat.

The blessing for Joseph is unique in its being the longest one (61 words)[423] and in its being not a prediction but an utterance which contains an explicit blessing (Gen 49:25-26; cf. Deut 33:1).[424] The idea of God (אל) as helping (עזר) Joseph (Gen 49:25) seems to have been borrowed from Deut 33:26. The conclusive part of Jacob's utterance to Joseph, namely the explicit blessing (Gen 49:25-26), which contains references to the heaven regarded as a source of blessing (Gen 49:25), to the primeval ocean (Gen 49:25), to the mountains (leg. הררי: Gen 49:26), to the everlasting hills (Gen 49:26), and to the blessings on the head of Joseph, on the skull of the one consecrated among his brothers (Gen 49:26), was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 33:13.15-16.[425] In his reworking of this text, in line with his theological ideas, the author of Genesis replaced the Deuteronomic reference to the sun and the moon (Deut 33:14), the heavenly bodies which could potentially be deified (cf. Gen 1:14-16), with a theologically more neutral one, namely that to the breasts and the womb (Gen 49:25). By describing Joseph as the one consecrated (נזיר) among his brothers (Gen 49:26; cf. Deut 33:16; cf. also Exod 29:6; 39:30 etc.), the author of Genesis presented the tribe of Joseph, and consequently Ephraim, as performing the most important, consecrated, priestly-like function in the postexilic Israel.

The conclusion of the section, which somewhat surprisingly describes all twelve Jacob's utterances to his sons as blessings which were given to the

---

421 Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, 'Benjamin Traditions', 637.

422 Cf. É. Nodet, *Samaritains*, 73-74.

423 Cf. B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 382; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 176.

424 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 633; P. N. Tarazi, *Genesis*, 177.

425 Cf. L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 4, 463, 501-502. It is also possible that שׁור in Gen 49:22 alludes to Deut 33:17.

twelve tribes of Israel (Gen 49:28; diff. 49:1-2),[426] is an evident reworking of Deut 33:1 (cf. 33:5).

Accordingly, in Gen 49:1-28 the author of Genesis in a creative way reworked Moses' blessing for the sons of Israel (Deut 33). He did it with the use of the widely understandable motif of an old father predicting the future of his children before his death and with the use of linguistic-etymological plays on the names of some of the Israelite tribes.

2.30 Death and burial of the main heroes, obedience to testamentary words, and establishing the line of spiritual succession (Gen 49:29-50:26; cf. Deut 34)

The motifs of death and burial of the main heroes, obedience to testamentary words, and establishing the line of spiritual succession (Gen 49:29-50:26) structurally correspond to similar motifs in Deut 34.

The linguistic correspondence between Gen 49:29-50:26 and Deut 34 is provided by numerous common key words and phrases of both texts: ארץ ([promised] 'land': Gen 49:30; 50:5.11.13.24; Deut 34:1-2.4), שׂמה ('there' [pointing to Canaan]: Gen 49:31; 50:5; Deut 34:4), יום ([a number of] 'days' [of mourning]: Gen 50:3; Deut 34:8), ויבכו ('and they wept' [for the main hero]: Gen 50:3; cf. 50:1.4; Deut 34:8), פרעה ('Pharaoh' [with his court]: Gen 50:4.6-7; Deut 34:11), עבד ('servant' [of Pharaoh]: Gen 50:7; Deut 34:11), אבל ('mourning' [for the main hero]: Gen 50:10-11; Deut 34:8), ויקברו\ויקבר אתו ('and [they] buried him' [the main hero]: Gen 50:13; cf. 49:29.31; 50:5-7.14; Deut 34:6), שׁבע לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב ('swear to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob': Gen 50:24; Deut 34:4), ישׂראל ([all] 'Israel': Gen 50:25; cf. 50:2; Deut 34:8-10.12), וימת ('and he died' [referring to the main hero]: Gen 50:26; Deut 34:5), and בן־מאה ועשׂר\ועשׂרים שׁנים\שׁנה ('one hundred and ten/twenty years old': Gen 50:26; Deut 34:7).

The direction of the hypertextual relationship between Gen 49:29-50:26 and Deut 34 is relatively easy to ascertain. The bipartite account of the death and burial of Jacob and Joseph (Gen 49:29-50:13; 50:22.26) is a result of a doubling

---

426 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 633; K. Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*, trans. J. D. Nogalski (SLTHS 3; Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2010), 84.

of the account of the death and burial of Moses (Deut 34:1-8), a modification which was necessary for concluding the story about the two main heroes Jacob and Joseph. Moreover, the surprising remark concerning weeping for Jacob both forty and seventy days (Gen 50:3) evidently originates from a reworking of the original remark concerning weeping for Moses thirty days (Deut 34:8; cf. Num 20:29).

Accordingly, the concluding account of the death and burial of Jacob and Joseph (Gen 49:29-50:26) is a reworking of the likewise concluding Deuteronomic account of the death and burial of Moses (Deut 34). The author of Genesis narratively doubled the account of the death and burial of Moses (Deut 34:1-8) in order to conclude the story about both Jacob (Gen 49:29-50:13) and Joseph (Gen 50:22.26). In this way, not only the first, 'universal' level of narrative reworking of Deuteronomy in Genesis, but also the third, 'biographic' one (concerning Jacob and Joseph) found their adequate conclusions in Gen 49:29-50:26. The second, 'successional' level, like the story of Deuteronomy, awaits its conclusion in the burial of Joseph's bones in the centre of Canaan (diff. Deut 34:6; Gen 50:13.26), in the inheritance of Joseph's descendants at Shechem (Josh 24:32; cf. 24:33).

The motif of Jacob longing to be buried in the land of Canaan (Gen 49:29-30; 50:5) illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of Moses longing to enter that land (Deut 34:1-4 etc.). The author of Genesis reworked this motif with the use of the easily understandable image of an old man wanting to be buried together with his closest relatives (Gen 49:31), in the grave which he had earlier prepared for himself (Gen 50:5). On the other hand, the motif of burying Jacob, the main hero of the old generation of the Israelites, in a cave in southern Judaea, and not in Canaan proper (Gen 49:29-32; 50:10-13; cf. 47:29-30), alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of burying Moses in a valley in the land of Moab (Deut 34:6). It is possible that the somewhat surprising reference to Abraham and Jacob's grave as located opposite (על־פני) Mamre, that is Hebron (Gen 49:30; 50:13; cf. 23:19; 25:9; cf. also 23:17), alludes to the reference to Moses' grave as located opposite Jericho (Deut 34:1.6). The motif of regarding the land of Canaan as located 'there', that is far away from the point of view of the narrative hero (Gen 49:31; 50:5), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that before his death Moses saw the land of Canaan from afar (Deut 34:4).

The motif of weeping over or for Israel's main hero (Gen 50:1.3) was borrowed from Deut 34:8. The somewhat strange idea that the Egyptians wept for Israel seventy days, that is forty days which were required for embalming the

body and then evidently thirty additional days (Gen 50:3),[427] originates from the Deuteronomic idea of weeping for Moses thirty days (Deut 34:8; cf. Num 20:29), that is one month (cf. Deut 21:13).[428] The author of Genesis reworked this idea in such a way that the number of the days of weeping for Israel came to be perfect (seventy: cf. Gen 50:10).[429]

The idea of Joseph as swearing (שׁבע) to Jacob that he will be buried in the land of Canaan (Gen 50:5-6; cf. 47:31) originates from the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as swearing to, among others, Jacob that his descendants will receive the land of Canaan (Deut 34:4 etc.). The author of Genesis illustrated this particularly Israelite, highly theological idea with the use of the widely understandable motif of a son swearing to his father that the latter will be buried together with his closest relatives.

The surprising thought that all the servants (כל־עבדי) of Pharaoh and all (כל) the elders of the land of Egypt (ארץ־מצרים) went together with Joseph to Canaan (however, since they were Gentiles, they only went to Transjordan)[430] in order to participate in the burial of his father (Gen 50:7; cf. 50:6.9.11.14)[431] is a reworking of the Deuteronomic thought that Moses performed signs and wonders in the land of Egypt against Pharaoh, all his servants, and all his land (Deut 34:11). The author of Genesis reworked this Deuteronomic thought in a positive-irenical way. He reformulated the idea that all Pharaoh's servants and all his land experienced punitive signs and wonders, which were inflicted upon them by the Israelites, into that of the Egyptians' military but friendly participation in Israel's burial.

The strange idea of mourning for Jacob first in a place beyond the Jordan (בעבר הירדן: Gen 50:10-11)[432] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of mourning for Moses in the plains of Moab (Deut 34:8), that is beyond the Jordan (Deut 1:5).

---

427 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 917; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 386; D. Volgger, *Und dann*, 103-104, 128.

428 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 872.

429 For the use of the symbolic numbers of seven, twelve, ten, and their multiples in ancient Near Eastern texts, see R. Zadok, 'Neo-Assyrian', 313-319.

430 Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 489.

431 Cf. J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 647-648; L. Ruppert, *Genesis*, vol. 4, 519-520; D. Volgger, *Und dann*, 107.

432 Joseph's route to Canaan is not the shortest one (i.e. through Gaza), but it reflects the long route of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt and of their entry to Canaan via Transjordan (cf. Deut 1-3). Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 697; J. Ebach, *Genesis 37-50*, 644, 649; B. T. Arnold, *Genesis*, 386-387.

The subsequent thought that the sons (בני) of Israel did (ויעשׂו) for him as he had commanded (כאשר צוה) them (Gen 50:12) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that the sons of Israel did as Yahweh had commanded Moses (Deut 34:9). The account of Joseph forgiving his brothers just as his father had commanded (צוה) before he died (מות: Gen 50:15-17; cf. 50:18-21) illustrates the same Deuteronomic thought (Deut 34:9; cf. 34:5.7). Accordingly, with the use of the widely understandable motif of the sons obeying the last will of their dying father, the author of Genesis illustrated the particularly Israelite, Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' obedience to Yahweh's will, which was revealed to them through the dying Moses.

The description of Joseph as seeing (ראה) the descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 50:23) may allude to the motif of Moses seeing the land of Ephraim and Manasseh (Deut 34:1-2). The motif of Makir as the son of Manasseh (Gen 50:23) originates from Deut 3:13-15 (cf. Josh 13:31; 17:1.3; cf. also Judg 5:14). The motif of the land which God swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob (Gen 50:24) was borrowed from Deut 34:4.

The idea that the sons of Israel should carry up Joseph's bones from Egypt (Gen 50:25) finds its fulfilment in Josh 24:32 (cf. Exod 13:19). The conclusive thought that Joseph died, being one hundred and ten years old (Gen 50:26; cf. 50:22), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Moses died, being one hundred and twenty years old (Deut 34:5.7). The author of Genesis changed the number of the years of the main hero's life from 120 to 110 in order to assimilate Joseph to Joshua, the successor to Moses (Josh 24:29), who understandably lived shorter than his great master.[433] In this way, the author of Genesis showed that Joseph, like Joshua (cf. Deut 34:9), became the spiritual heir of Israel and the link which provided spiritual succession between the generations of the forefathers (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), who knew God face to face (cf. Deut 34:10),[434] and all subsequent generations of the Ephraimites (Gen 50:23.26).[435]

Accordingly, in Gen 49:29-50:26 the author of Genesis reworked the Deuteronomic account of the death and burial of Moses, and of Joshua becoming his spiritual successor (Deut 34), with the use of the widely understandable motifs

---

433 Cf. T. C. Butler, *Joshua* (WBC 7; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1983), 283. This fact suggests that the book of Genesis, with its idea of Joseph as surprisingly living only 110 years, unlike his ancestors (cf. Gen 47:28 etc.), is literarily dependent on the book of Joshua, and not vice versa.

434 Cf. K. A. Mathews, *Genesis 11:27-50:26*, 929-930.

435 Cf. V. P. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, 711 n. 20.

of the sons obeying the last will of their dying father and of establishing the line of succession between the great-grandfather and his great-grandchildren.

2.31 Conclusions

The analysis of the sequences of the main themes, as well as the key words and phrases, of Genesis and Deuteronomy, with the use of the method of critical intertextual research, has revealed that Deuteronomy functioned as a structuring hypotext for Genesis.

Three main facts prove this thesis. First, notwithstanding all literary and theological differences between Genesis and Deuteronomy, a common sequence of main themes may be traced in both these works. Second, the thematically corresponding sections of Genesis and Deuteronomy were composed with the use of numerous common key words and phrases, which are at times distinctive of both these works in the Bible (ידע טוב ורע: Gen 3:5.22 and Deut 1:39; רמשׂ, כל, אדמה, כל, דגה\דג: Gen 9:2 and Deut 4:18; עשׂר עשׂר: Gen 28:22 and Deut 14:22; יבם: Gen 38:8 and Deut 25:5.7; תהום רבצת תחת: Gen 49:25 and Deut 33:13; לראשׁ יוסף ולקדקד נזיר אחיו: Gen 49:26 and Deut 33:16). Third, numerous not easily perceivable narrative inconsistencies of Genesis, as well as its other somewhat surprising or enigmatic literary features, can be explained by the hypothesis of literary dependence of Genesis on Deuteronomy and not vice versa.

Accordingly, Genesis should be regarded as a result of a systematic, sequential, hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy. For this reason, the particular literary relationship of Genesis to Deuteronomy is thematically ordered on the one hand and highly creative on the other.

The detailed analysis of Genesis with the use of the method of critical intertextual research has revealed that the author of Genesis reworked the contents of Deuteronomy in a very sophisticated way. In general, the author of Genesis resolved to reformulate the contents of Israel's sacred book of Deuteronomy in more modern (at that time) and more universalistic literary codes.[436] The literary form of Deuteronomy, namely that of a rhetorically stipulated covenant, was therefore replaced in Genesis with the easily understandable form of a parahistorical narrative. The ideas of this narrative illustrate, but also significantly modify, the ideas of Deuteronomy.

436 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Prologue*, 330-333.

There are three main levels of systematic, sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy in Genesis. The first of them is the 'universal' level of sequential hypertextual reworking of the whole book of Deuteronomy in the whole book of Genesis. On this level, the Deuteronomic story about Israel's original sin, defeat of the Gentiles in Transjordan, and the preparations for the entry to Canaan, up to the death and burial of Moses, functions as a structuring hypotext for the story about humanity's original sin, the universal flood, and initial dwelling of Israel's forefathers in Canaan, up to the death and burial of Jacob and Joseph.

The second, 'successional' level is the level of hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic story in the stories about the successions of generations (תולדות) of humanity and Israel's forefathers, especially those of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. On this level, for example, Cain with his descendants represents the older, sinful generation of the Israelites who had to die in the wilderness, and Seth with his descendants represents the new, innocent generation who could hope for long life (Gen 4-5). Likewise, in the story about Israel's forefathers (Gen 12-50), the patriarch Abraham represents Moses; Lot and Ishmael stand for the older, sinful generation of the Israelites, who despised the land of Canaan and did not inherit it; Isaac symbolizes the younger, innocent generation which was born in the wilderness; the struggling Jacob represents the generation of Israel's leader Joshua; and Joseph is the patriarch of the exiled but righteous Ephraimites who hoped for a return to central Canaan and for dwelling of their sons there forever.

The third, 'biographic' level is the level of hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic story in a story about one narrative character. On this level, the story about the course of life of a particular narrative character illustrates the whole story narrated in Deuteronomy. For example, the story about the life of Abraham, from his initial entry to Canaan up to his death and burial (Gen 12:1-25:10), illustrates the Deuteronomic story about the Israelites, from their initial entry to Canaan up to the death and burial of Moses. Accordingly, the complex way of sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy in Genesis may be compared to generating three waves of various lengths, which interfere with one another.

Even a superficial analysis of Genesis reveals that the region of Transjordan plays no significant role in its geographical-narrative logic, in difference to that of Deuteronomy. Most probably, at the time of the composition of Genesis, in the political situation of the Persian province of Samaria, there was no real hope

for Israel's reconquest of Transjordan. For this reason, the author of Genesis presented Judaea, and not Transjordan, as the antechamber of central, Israelite Canaan, that is Canaan proper. In the story of Genesis, like in Deuteronomy (Deut 33:7), Judaea is an unorthodox territory, in which the patriarchs make covenants with the Canaanites (esp. Gen 14:13; 21:27.32; 26:28.34-35; diff. Deut 7:2; cf. also Josh 15:63; Judg 1:21), and in which there is no altar of burnt offerings for Yahweh. Likewise, Judah is guilty of selling his Israelite brother Joseph into slavery (Gen 37:27-28; cf. 37:36), and for this reason he deserves the penalty of death (Deut 24:7; cf. also Gen 38). In fact, in his narrative description of the land of Canaan, the Israelite author of Genesis never mentioned Judaea's capital Jerusalem, effectively condemning it to *damnatio memoriae* (cf. also Judg 19:10-12: 'Jebus'). For this reason, even the location of Abraham and Jacob's grave in the distant Hebron (Gen 23:2-20; 25:9-10; 49:29-32; 50:13) resembles that of Moses' grave in the land of Moab (Deut 34:6), thus merely foreshadowing the location of Joseph's grave at Shechem, in the heart of Canaan (Josh 24:32; cf. 20:7; 24:1.25; cf. also Gen 35:19-20; 48:7).

On the other hand, the Israelite author of Genesis, similarly to the likewise Israelite authors of Deuteronomy (cf. esp. Deut 11:29-12:28; 33:13-17) and Joshua (cf. esp. Josh 24), highlighted the importance of Shechem (Gen 12:5-7; 33:18-34:31; 35:4; 37:12-14; 48:22; cf. 22:1-18) and of the Ephraimite patriarch Joseph (Gen 37; 39-50).

There is no compelling evidence for the use of postulated, pre-Pentateuchal literary sources or traditions (J, E, D, P, etc.) in Genesis.[437] On the other hand, the author of Genesis knew and used the book of Joshua,[438] and probably also the book of Judges.[439] Moreover, he used the works of several Israelite and

---

437 Cf. C. Houtman, *Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung* (CBET 9; Kok Pharos: Kampen 1994), 377-419. It should be noted that Wellhausen's theory was hermeneutically conditioned by the difference, as it was perceived by him, between individual responsibility before God (cf. J, E, D) and various forms of institutional cultus (cf. P): see M. Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (VTSup 100; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2004), 3-5, 15; P. Machinist, 'The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology', in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (VTSup 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 469-531 (esp. 475-477, 481-482).

438 Cf. esp. Gen 28:19 and Josh 16:2; Gen 33:20 and Josh 8:30-31; Gen 48:22 and Josh 24:32; Gen 50:22 and Josh 24:29.

439 Cf. esp. Gen 22:3.6-7.9 and Judg 6:26; Gen 28:19 and Judg 1:23.

Judaean prophets, especially Hosea,[440] Isaiah,[441] Jeremiah,[442] Ezekiel,[443] and Deutero-Isaiah.[444]

In his hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the author of Genesis also used numerous non-Yahwistic literary motifs. In particular, the literary prehistory of Israel (Gen 1-11) is replete with allusions to Mesopotamian motifs (e.g. creation of the universe and humankind, creation and humanization of a man through the agency of a woman, humans having once had the chance of being immortal, two fraternized ancient heroes, seven antediluvian sages, universal flood, and building a city and a tower in Babylon), which may be found especially in *Enuma Elish* and in the *Gilgamesh Epic*. The author of Genesis creatively used numerous Mesopotamian motifs in Gen 1-11 in order to illustrate the contents of the initial section of Deuteronomy, which refers to Israel's travel through non-Israelite territories (Deut 1-5).

Traditional folklore was another important source of literary motifs of Genesis. In fact, the author of Genesis illustrated numerous ideas of Deuteronomy with the use of variegated folkloristic motifs. Most of them are related to family matters, like sibling rivalry, generational conflicts, tensions between fertile and barren wives, looking for a suitable wife, obtaining the privilege of birthright in reward for a specially prepared meal, encountering the future bride by a well, and a father-in-law having sexual relationship with his daughter-in-law. At times, they deal with social issues, such as respectful reception of important guests or prolonged bargaining for something important. With the use of such folkloristic motifs, the author of Genesis illustrated numerous highly theological ideas of Deuteronomy in a vivid and widely understandable way. It may be asked whether his aim was catechetic (explaining theological and legal ideas to the young generation of the Israelites) or missionary (explaining particularly Is-

---

440 Cf. e.g. Gen 25:23-26 and Hos 12:3-4; Gen 27:43-31:42 and Hos 12:13; Gen 28:10-22 and Hos 12:4-6; Gen 32:25-33 and Hos 12:4-5; Gen 35:1-15 and Hos 12:5.

441 Cf. e.g. Gen 2:13-14 and Is 19:23-25; Gen 15:9.17 and Is 6:2-4; Gen 21:14-20 and Is 35:3-6.

442 Cf. e.g. Gen 1:2 and Jer 4:23; Gen 35:16-19 and Jer 31:15; Gen 37:20-36 and Jer 38:6-13; Gen 43:8.10 and Jer 41:16-44:30.

443 Cf. e.g. Gen 2:8-3:24 and Ezek 28:13 etc.; Gen 4:13 and Ezek 9:9; Gen 4:15 and Ezek 9:4.6; Gen 6:4 and Ezek 32:27; Gen 6:9-8:18 etc. and Ezek 14:22-23; Gen 9:15-17 and Ezek 16:60; Gen 15:1.4 and Ezek 1:1-3; Gen 15:9 and Ezek 1:11; Gen 17:1 and Ezek 10:5; Gen 36:2 and Ezek 23:4 etc.; Gen 37:26 and Ezek 24:7-8.

444 Cf. e.g. Gen 1:1-2:4 and Is 42:5 etc.; Gen 17:15 and Is 51:2 etc.; Gen 22:7-10 and Is 53:7.

raelite ideas to non-Israelites). In any case, he succeeded in composing a narrative which captivates the imagination of people of all ages and all regions of the world.

The author of Genesis seems to have also used some Greek literary motifs, especially those which are known from Euripides' tragedies. These motifs may be found in the sections of Genesis which are somehow related to the Gentiles' lack of proper faith and moral behaviour. For example, they may be traced in the account of the behaviour of Lot's Sodomite relatives (Gen 19:17.26), in the negative allusion to the Gentiles as sacrificing their children as burnt offerings to their gods (Gen 22:2-18), and in the account of the Gentile wife who made amorous advances to her husband's young but upright male dependant (Gen 39:7-20). It may be argued that in the aftermath of the Persian wars against the Greeks, as a consequence of the presence of Greek mercenaries in the Persian army,[445] and because of the influence of Greek culture in Phoenicia, the Israelites knew at least some elements of Greek culture. In fact, the author of Genesis, with his interest in gathering and using various pieces of information about the inhabitants and cultures of the whole known world from Greece in the west to Mesopotamia in the east (e.g. Gen 10) in one ethnographic-historical narrative, to a great extent resembles the Greek historian, geographer, and ethnographer Herodotus.[446]

The contents of Genesis suggest that this work was written not earlier than in the fifth century BC. In particular, the so-called Table of Nations in Gen 10, with its enumeration of nations from Ionia in the west and Ethiopia in the south to India in the east, seems to reflect the diversity of nations within the borders of the Persian Empire in the fifth century BC. Likewise, the paradigmatic character of the divine punishment which was inflicted on Babylon (Gen 11:5-9) and not, for example, on Nineveh (cf. e.g. Nah 1:1; Zeph 2:13; cf. also Gen 10:11-12) suggests that Genesis was written after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, in the Persian period. In particular, since Gen 11:5-9 evidently alludes to the

---

445 Hence, for example, the use of the surprising name מכרת for sword (diff. Gen 34:25; cf. Greek μάχαιρα) in Gen 49:5?

446 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Prologue*, 32-34; J.-W. Wesselius, *The Origin of the History of Israel: Herodotus's* Histories *as Blueprint for the First Books of the Bible* (JSOTSup 345; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2002), 1-68; R. Gnuse, 'From Prison to Prestige: The Hero Who Helps a King in Jewish and Greek Literature', *CBQ* 72 (2010) 31-45.

demise of Babylon's famous ziggurat, a fact which occurred *c*.538-483 BC, then Genesis must have been written *c*.450-400 BC, most probably *c*.400 BC.[447]

The theological ideas of Genesis notably differ from those of Deuteronomy. In particular, with only a few exceptions (e.g. Gen 1:28-30; 2:16-17; 9:4-5), Genesis contains no references to any revealed, divine law. In fact, the narrative of Genesis, which is a creative but systematic reworking of the contents of Deuteronomy, functions as 'the law without the law'.[448] In his presentation of humanity and Israel's prehistory, the author of Genesis resolved to reformulate the divinely sanctioned commandments, instructions, and exhortations of Deuteronomy into references and allusions to universally binding moral values and to widely understandable cultural conventions, traditional customs, human preferences, and natural attitudes.

For example, everyone agrees that some particular time is needed as the time of rest after a period of hard work (Gen 2:2-3; cf. Exod 20:11; diff. Deut 5:15). Everyone agrees that even in a garden there may be some fruits which should not be eaten (Gen 2:16-17). Everyone agrees that the relationship between the husband and the wife is very intimate and for this reason very strong (Gen 2:24). Everyone agrees that the consequences of a sin, when it becomes widely known, are shaming (Gen 3:7), etc.

One of the main differences between Deuteronomy and Genesis, a work which may be regarded as 'the law without the law', lies in the attitude of Genesis to the divinely sanctioned holy war. With the use of his hypertextual stories, the author of Genesis almost entirely defused this politically dangerous and potentially destructive concept.

For example, in difference to Deut 2:24-3:11 the author of Genesis presented the destruction of sinful humans as a consequence of a natural, and in fact only legendary, disaster (Gen 6:5-8:19). In difference to Deut 7 he described the ancestor of the Israelites as fighting only a just war and as being ready to establish peace with righteous Gentiles in Canaan (Gen 13-15). In difference to Deut 11:1-25 the author of Genesis presented the problem of evil of the Gentiles as mainly God's problem, which should be dealt with by means of the Israelites' intercessory prayer (Gen 18-20). In difference to Deut 20:1-9 he described Israel's conflict in Canaan as an eventually peaceful encounter of two estranged brothers (Gen 32:1-33:17). In difference to Deut 20:10-20 the author of Genesis

---

447 Cf. also T. L. Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary* (Oxford University: New York [et al] 2001), 83.

448 Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, *Theology*, 121-125.

presented the land in Canaan as bought and not simply conquered by the Israelites (Gen 33:19). Moreover, he presented the Israelites' conflict with the Canaanites (cf. Deut 20:10-20) as partially justified by the Canaanites' sinful, presumptuous, and deceitful behaviour, but on the other hand as morally disproportionate and politically dangerous (Gen 34). Accordingly, Genesis may be regarded as a consciously irenical counterbalance to the earlier written, militant book of Joshua.

The recognition of this fact may have great consequences for finding a solution to the present conflict over the land in Israel, and consequently between the great monotheistic civilizations in our world. Genesis, which is a part of the divinely inspired Pentateuch, shows how a peaceful life of believing Israelites with righteous non-Israelites in Canaan may be possible.

Chapter 3: Exodus-Numbers as an Israelite sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy

Since the book of Genesis is a sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers seem merely to fill the narrative gap between the story about the origins of humanity and Israel (Gen) and the story about the preparations for Israel's entry to the land of Canaan (Deut). However, a detailed intertextual analysis of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers on the one hand and Deuteronomy on the other reveals that these three works taken together constitute another example of sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy.

3.1 God-given power and protection of Israel against mighty Gentiles (Exod 1:1-2:10; cf. Deut 1:1-40)

The combination of the motifs of Israel's power, overseers over the Israelites, Israel's fear of mighty Gentiles and their cities, two faithful persons as positive exceptions, God's blessing for their descendants, God's powerful activity in Egypt, a little child who will enter the land of Canaan, the ark, and God's special protection (Exod 1:1-2:10) originates from Deut 1:1-40.

In particular, the somewhat surprising way of beginning the story with the pronoun 'these' (אלה: Exod 1:1) alludes to Deut 1:1. Likewise, the introductory motif of the twelve sons of Israel (בני ישׂראל) in the exile (Exod 1:1-7.9.12-13) was borrowed from Deut 1:3.23 (cf. 1:1). The motif of the Israelites exceedingly multiplying (רבה) in the exile (Exod 1:7.10.12.20) was borrowed from Deut 1:10-11.

The motif of Israel fighting (לחם) and with God's aid prevailing over a powerful Gentile king (מלך) and other Gentile enemies (Exod 1:8-10.15-20) originates from Deut 1:4.7-8.20-21.30. The somewhat surprisingly introduced idea of Israel as going up (עלה) from Egypt to Canaan (Exod 1:10)[1] was borrowed from

1 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus* (ECC; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2009), 71; J. Lemański, *Księga Wyjścia: Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (NKBST 2; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2009), 106;

Deut 1:21-22.24.26.28. The correlated ideas of an encouragement (הבה) to be wise (חכם: Exod 1:10) and of setting (שׂים) commanders (שׂרי) over (על) the Israelites (Exod 1:11) originate from Deut 1:13.15. The motif of the Gentiles' powerful cities (ערים: Exod 1:11) was borrowed from Deut 1:22.28. The motif of the Israelites being burdened with hard (קשׁה) work (Exod 1:11.13-14) originates from Deut 1:12.16-17.

The motif of two faithful, named persons as positive exceptions to the Israelites' fear of the Gentiles (Exod 1:15-19) originates from Deut 1:36.38 (cf. 1:28.32-33). Likewise, the motif of God blessing the exceptional persons and their descendants (Exod 1:20-21) was borrowed from Deut 1:36.38.

The idea of Moses as a little innocent child, who did not know God's will[2] and who later entered the land of Canaan (Exod 2:1-10), is based on Deut 1:39. The motif of a life-saving ark or chest (Exod 2:3.5) alludes, like in Gen 6:14-9:18, to Yahweh's life-saving sanctuary (cf. Deut 1:39). The motif of reeds (סוף: Exod 2:3.5) was borrowed from Deut 1:40 (cf. also 1:1). The motif of God's special protection for the little Israelite child Moses in a Gentile territory (Exod 2:5-10) was borrowed from Deut 1:31 and elaborated with the use of the well-known literary motif which could be found, for example, in the birth legend of the Gentile king Sargon of Akkad.[3]

3.2 Unholy attack on a Gentile and the subsequent escape to the wilderness (Exod 2:11-15; cf. Deut 1:41-46)

The account of Moses' violent, ungodly attack on a Gentile and of his subsequent escape to the wilderness (Exod 2:11-15) is a reworking of the Deuter-

---

C. Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* (FAT 73; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010), 44.

2 Cf. B. Adamczewski, '"Kim ja jestem?" (Wj 3,11) – Mojżesza droga do patriotyzmu', *RTWP* 4 (2004-2008) 19-36 (esp. 20-23).

3 Cf. M. Gerhards, *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose: Literatur- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Schlüsseltext des nichtpriesterlichen Tetrateuch* (WMANT 109; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2006), 149-249; C. Briffard, 'Moïse *versus* Sargon', *VT* 60 (2010) 479-482; K. L. Sparks, 'Genre Criticism', in T. B. Dozeman (ed.), *Methods for Exodus* (MBI; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2010), 55-94 (esp. 84-85).

onomic account of the Israelites' unholy war against the Canaanites (Deut 1:41-46).

In particular, the description of Moses' apparently justified but in fact ungodly attack on an Egyptian (Exod 2:11-12) is thematically based on Deut 1:41-43 (cf. also 2:14: 'men of war'). The subsequent account of the consequences of Moses ungodly activity, namely confusion among the Israelites, Moses' fear, and Moses' escape to the wilderness (Exod 2:13-15), is thematically based on Deut 1:44. The concluding statement concerning Moses as remaining (ישׁב) by a well in the wilderness (Exod 2:15) alludes to the Deuteronomic description of the Israelites as remaining at Kadesh-barnea (Deut 1:45-46).

3.3 Forty years in the wilderness, doing no harm to the Midianites, and longing in the exile (Exod 2:16-25; cf. Deut 2-3)

The combination of the motifs of Moses spending forty years in the wilderness, doing no harm to the Midianites, and longing in the exile (Exod 2:16-25) originates from Deut 2-3.

In particular, the motif of Midian (Exod 2:15-16; 3:1; 4:19; 18:1 etc.) alludes to the motif of the Israelites remaining in the wilderness between Egypt and Canaan, south and east of Kadesh-barnea (Deut 2:1-12; cf. Gen 37:28.36). Consequently, the idea of Moses as saving weak Midianite women by a well with water (Exod 2:16-17) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas that the Israelites should do no harm to the weaker Edomites and that they should buy water from the Edomites for money (Deut 2:4-6). Similarly, the name Reuel (רעואל: Exod 2:18; diff. 3:1 etc.) narratively illustrates the idea of being a son of Esau (cf. Deut 2:4-5.8.12.22.29; Gen 36:4.10.13.17).[4] The motif of Moses eating (אכל) bread of the Midianites as their guest (Exod 2:20) likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should buy food from the Edomites for money (Deut 2:6).

The idea of Moses as long dwelling (ישׁב) in the land of Midian (Exod 2:21) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as long dwelling in the land of Moab (Deut 3:29). The image of Moses as begetting a son in the wilderness

---

4 Cf. W. C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1998), 172.

(Exod 2:21-22) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the new generation of the Israelites, which was born in the wilderness (Deut 2:14-16). The particular name of this son, namely Gershom, which alludes to Moses as in the exile longing to see his homeland (Exod 2:22),[5] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of Moses as in the exile longing to see the land of Canaan (Deut 3:23-28).

The idea of Moses as staying in the land of Midian 'many days' (ימים רבים: Exod 2:23) alludes to a similar idea in Deut 1:46; 2:1. Since according to Exod 7:7 Moses was eighty years old when he spoke to Pharaoh, the reader may reasonably assume that Moses was forty years old when he fled from Egypt (Exod 2:15; cf. 2:11) and that he spent another forty years in the land of Midian (Exod 2:16-25; cf. 4:19-20). Consequently, the idea of Moses as dwelling forty years in the land of Midian (Exod 2:21) alludes to the motif of the Israelites remaining forty years in the wilderness and in the land of Moab (Deut 2:7.14 etc.).

The thought that after this long period of time the king of Egypt died (מות: Exod 2:23) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the generation of the men of war finally died (Deut 2:16). The concluding, somewhat surprising statement that God knew (ידע) the Israelites' hardships (Exod 2:25; cf. 2:23-24)[6] most probably illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that God knew the Israelites' way through the great wilderness (Deut 2:7).

3.4 Encounter with Yahweh in fire at Mount Horeb (Exod 3; cf. Deut 4:1-5:22)

The account of Moses' encounter with Yahweh in fire at Mount Horeb (Exod 3) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic fragment which refers, among others, to Israel's encounter with Yahweh in fire and cloud at Mount Horeb (Deut 4:1-5:22; esp. 4:10-12.15.20.33-38; 5:2-4).

In particular, the motif of Horeb (חרב) as the mountain (הר) of God (Exod 3:1; cf. 17:6; 33:6) was borrowed from Deut 1:6; cf. 1:19; 4:10.15; 5:2 etc.[7] The idea of Moses as seeing (ראה) the angel of Yahweh and not Yahweh in person (Exod 3:2; cf. 3:6; diff. 3:16; 4:1.5) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the

---

5 Cf. B. Adamczewski, 'Kim ja jestem?', 27-29.

6 Cf. D. G. Stuart, *Exodus* (NAC 2; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2006), 104 n. 159; T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 93; C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 64-65.

7 Cf. J. Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1994), 287-288.

Israelites at Mount Horeb heard Yahweh's voice but saw no form (Deut 4:12.15; cf. also 4:16-19.23.25.28). The related idea of Moses as seeing (ראה) Yahweh's revelation in a flame of fire (אשׁ) out of a burning (בער) bush (Exod 3:2-4) in a widely understandable way illustrates the Deuteronomic, highly theological idea that the Israelites at Mount Horeb saw Yahweh's burning fire (Deut 4:11-12.36 etc.). The somewhat surprising thought that Yahweh revealed himself in a bush (סנה: Exod 3:2-4) originates from Deut 33:16. The motif of Yahweh's fire (אשׁ) as normally consuming (אכל) everything (Exod 3:2) was borrowed from Deut 4:24 etc. Likewise, the thought that Moses heard Yahweh's voice from the midst (מתוך) of fire (Exod 3:4; cf. 3:2) was borrowed from Deut 4:12.15.33.36; 5:4.22 etc.

The idea of approaching (קרב) the place of Yahweh's revelation only to a certain distance (Exod 3:5) was borrowed from Deut 4:11 (cf. 5:23; diff. 5:27). The related, quite surprising (in the context of hot stones in the wilderness)[8] statement that Moses had to remove his sandals from his feet, for the place where he stood was holy (שׁל־נעליך מעל רגליך כי המקום אשׁר אתה עומד עלו קדשׁ הוא: Exod 3:5), was borrowed from Josh 5:15,[9] where it quite naturally refers to Joshua as entering the fruitful plains of Jericho in the holy land of Canaan (cf. Josh 4:13; 6:1).[10] The motif of Yahweh as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob (Exod 3:6.15-16; 4:5) is evidently Deuteronomic (Deut 6:10 etc.).

The motif of Yahweh bringing the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan, a region regarded as a good land (ארץ טובה: Exod 3:8), was borrowed from Deut 4:20-22. The particular, somewhat surprising sequence of the motifs of the Israelites worshipping (עבד) Yahweh in the future (Exod 3:12) and of the importance of Yahweh's name (שׁם: Exod 3:13-15), which follows the motif of the revelation of the invisible God who brought the Israelites out of the land of Egypt (Exod 3:2-11),[11] was borrowed from the Decalogue (Deut 5:6-11).

The motif of Yahweh compelling the Egyptians with a mighty hand (ביד חזקה), in the midst (קרב) of them, to let the Israelites go (Exod 3:19-20) was borrowed from Deut 4:34; 5:15. The concluding thought that the Israelites should not go from Egypt empty-handed (ריקם), but that after many years of their slave labour in Egypt they should take from the Egyptians some equivalents of

---

8 Cf. J. Lemański, *Księga Wyjścia*, 144.

9 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 37-40.

10 This fact implies that Exodus, like Genesis, was written later than the book of Joshua.

11 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 120-121, 131-132; C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 86.

departure gifts (Exod 3:21-22), originates from the Deuteronomic law Deut 15:13-15.[12]

3.5 Moses as a mediator, signs for the elders of Israel, observing the commandments, bodily signs of love, and Yahweh's jealousy for idolatry (Exod 4; cf. Deut 5:23-6:19)

The combination of the motifs of Moses as a mediator between Yahweh and the Israelites, Yahweh's signs for the elders of Israel, observing Yahweh's commandments, bodily signs of love, and Yahweh's jealousy for idolatry (Exod 4) originates from Deut 5:23-6:19.

In particular, the motif of Yahweh's potentially deadly signs (אות) performed in the sight of the Israelites (Exod 4:1-9.17.28-31), a motif which was linguistically borrowed from Deut 4:34, is a reworking of the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites being afraid of Yahweh's potentially deadly prodigies at Mount Horeb (Deut 5:23-26; cf. 5:29). The subsequent thought that Aaron the Levite (cf. Deut 10:6.8) should act as a mediator between Moses (and consequently Yahweh) and the Israelites (Exod 4:10-16) is a reworking of the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that the priestly character of Moses (cf. Deut 9:7-10:11 etc.) was a mediator between Yahweh and the Israelites (Deut 5:27-33).

The subsequent reference to the sons (בנים) of Moses during his going (הלך) on the way (בדרך) to Egypt and during his spending a night there (Exod 4:20-24), a reference which is quite strange in the context of the remarks concerning Moses' only son Gershom (Exod 2:22; 4:25),[13] alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic statements concerning teaching God's law to the Israelites' children, especially while going on the way and while lying down (Deut 6:2.7).

The subsequent account Exod 4:24-26, which is widely regarded as enigmatic,[14] in a narrative way illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic ideas of ob-

---

12 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (WBC 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001), 310.

13 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 149; J. Lemański, *Księga Wyjścia*, 168; C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 123-124.

14 Cf. J. K. Bruckner, *Exodus* (NIBCOT 2; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Bletchley [et al.] 2008), 54; C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 129; A. J. Howell, 'The First-

serving Yahweh's commandments, bodily signs of love, and Yahweh's jealousy for idolatry (Deut 6:7-17). The author of Exodus illustrated these highly theological ideas with the use of a story about observing the custom of bodily circumcision and about woman's jealousy before Moses' going to the idolatrous land of Egypt (Exod 4:24-26).

The idea of Moses as announcing (נגד) to Aaron the words (דבר) of Yahweh at the mountain (בהר) of God (Exod 4:27-28) originates from Deut 5:5. The related idea of Moses and Aaron as speaking to the elders (זקנים) of Israel and performing the signs in the sight of the people (Exod 4:29-30) originates from Deut 5:23. The subsequent thought that the Israelites were persuaded by hearing (שׁמע) Yahweh's words, so that they respected and worshipped Yahweh (Exod 4:31), originates from the subsequent text Deut 5:24-29 (cf. 5:9).

3.6 Great signs and wonders against Pharaoh and his house, and observing Yahweh's ordinances (Exod 5:1-13:16; cf. Deut 6:20-25)

The account of great signs and wonders against Pharaoh and his house, and of observing Yahweh's ordinances (Exod 5:1-13:16) illustrates the main ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 6:20-25.

In particular, the thought that the Israelites were slaves (עבדים) of Pharaoh (פרעה) in Egypt (מצרים: Exod 5:15-16; 13:3.14) was borrowed from Deut 6:21b. The subsequent thought that Yahweh would bring the Israelites out of Egypt with an outstretched arm (יהוה + יצא + מצרים: Exod 6:6) was borrowed from the subsequent text Deut 6:21c (cf. 6:23). The subsequent idea of great (גדלים) signs (אתת) and wonders (מופתים) against Pharaoh (פרעה) and his house (בית) in Egypt (מצרים: Exod 7:3-4; cf. 7:9.28; 8:5.7.9.17.20.23; 10:1-2.6; 11:9-10; 12:30; 13:3.14) was borrowed from Deut 6:22 (cf. 11:3 etc.). The author of Exodus illustrated this idea with the use of the literary account of ten 'plagues of Egypt' (Exod 7:1-12:33) for Pharaoh who did not obey Yahweh's voice (שׁמע בקל + יהוה: Exod 5:2), which is based on the Deuteronomic curses (Deut 28:16-68; cf. also 7:15) for the Israelites who did not obey Yahweh's voice (Deut 28:15).[15] The

born Son of Moses as the "Relative of Blood" in Exodus 4.24-26', *JSOT* 35.1 (2010) 63-76 (esp. 75).

15 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 80-82.

subsequent thought that the custom of celebrating the Passover should be regarded as an ordinance (חק) which should be observed (שמר) by the Israelites (Exod 12:24-25; 13:10; cf. 12:17) illustrates the main thought of the subsequent Deuteronomic text Deut 6:24-25 (cf. 6:20).

The statement concerning the Israelite's son who would ask his father in the future, what (כי־ישאלך בנך מחר לאמר מה) is the meaning of the Israelites' ritual acts (Exod 12:26; 13:14), was borrowed from Deut 6:20. The related idea of answering (אמר) the son (Exod 12:27) was borrowed from Deut 6:21. The confirming statements that the Israelites did as Yahweh had commanded (עשה + כאשר צוה יהוה: Exod 12:28.50) likewise allude to Deut 6:20.24-25.

The thought that Yahweh would bring (בוא) the Israelites to the land (ארץ) which he swore to Israel's forefathers (אשר נשבע לאבת) to give (לתת) it (Exod 13:5; cf. 6:8; 12:25; 13:11) was borrowed from Deut 6:23. The related thought that with a strong hand Yahweh brought the Israelites out of Egypt (ביד חזקה + יצא + יהוה + ממצרים: Exod 13:9; cf. 13:3.14.16) was borrowed from Deut 6:21 (cf. 6:23).

3.7 Total destruction of mightier, militant Gentiles (Exod 13:17-15:21; cf. Deut 7)

The account of total destruction of mightier, militant Gentiles (Exod 13:17-15:21) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 7.

In particular, the narratively superfluous reference to Pharaoh as the king (מלך) of Egypt (Exod 14:5.8)[16] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the destruction of mighty Gentile kings (Deut 7:24). The ideas of Pharaoh's numerous and mighty Gentile people (עם: Exod 14:6; cf. 14:7.9 etc.) and of mighty Canaanite peoples (עמים: Exod 15:14) originate from Deut 7:19 (cf. 7:1). The thought that the Israelites went out of Egypt with an upraised arm (מצרים + יצא + ביד: Exod 14:8) originates from Deut 7:8.

The motif of the Israelites being afraid (ירא) of the mightier, militant Gentiles (Exod 14:10) and of Moses' encouragement not to be afraid (ירא) of them (Exod 14:13) originates from Deut 7:18-19. Likewise, the motif of stretching out (נטה) the right hand and Yahweh's arm (זרוע) against the Egyptians when the Israelites went out (יצא) of Egypt (Exod 14:16.21.26-27; 15:12.16; cf. 14:8.11)

16 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 312.

originates from Deut 7:19. The surprising description of the miraculously divided waters (המים) of the sea, so that dry land (חרבה) and dry ground (יבשׁה) appeared, and the Israelites went in the midst (בתוך) of the sea between walls of waters (Exod 14:21-22.29),[17] resulted from a reworking of the relatively natural description of miraculously divided waters of the Jordan, so that dry land and dry ground appeared, and the Israelites went in the midst of the Jordan beside a dam of water (Josh 3:16-17; cf. 4:22-23).[18] The ideas that the Israelites' Gentile enemies were destroyed by a miraculous but in itself natural disaster and that not one of them was left (שׁאר: Exod 14:28) originate from Deut 7:20. The author of Exodus illustrated these ideas with the use of the Deuteronomic motif of the destruction of the Egyptian army in the Sea of Reeds (Deut 11:4).[19] The thought that the Israelites saw (ראה) the great (גדל) things which Yahweh did (אשׁר עשׂה יהוה) to Pharaoh (פרעה) and to all Egypt (מצרים: Exod 14:27-31) originates from Deut 7:18-19.

The motif of the linguistically archaizing song (שׁירה) of Moses (Exod 15:1-19),[20] which originates from Deut 31:19-32:44 and which is supplemented with the echo-like song of Miriam (Exod 15:20-21), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should remember the great (גדל) things which Yahweh did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt (Deut 7:18).[21] The particular motif of Yahweh being awesome (נורא: Exod 15:11) was borrowed from Deut 7:21.

Accordingly, the author of Exodus, like the author of Genesis, almost completely deconstructed the Deuteronomic ideology of holy war, by reformulating it into that of intentionally peaceful exodus of the sons of Israel from the land of Egypt.

---

17 Cf. C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 361-362, 364.

18 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 143-145. This fact again implies that Exodus, like Genesis, was written later than the book of Joshua.

19 *Pace* J. Van Seters, *Life*, 132-133.

20 Cf. ibid. 147-148; W. M. Stabryła, *Któż taki jak JHWH? Analiza porównawcza tekstów Wj 15 i Ps 77* (SBP 3; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2007), 115-116.

21 For this reason, the song of Miriam (Exod 15:21; cf. 15:1) functions as a literary-rhetorical paradigm of the Israelites' recollections of the great things which Yahweh did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt (Deut 7:18), as they were 'remembered' in the song of Moses (Exod 15:1-19).

3.8 Testing in the wilderness, and manna and water (Exod 15:22-17:7; cf. Deut 8:1-16)

The story about Yahweh's testing the Israelites in the wilderness, and about his giving them manna and water (Exod 15:22-17:7) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 8:1-16.[22]

In particular, the idea of the Israelites as going (הלך) in the wilderness (במדבר: Exod 15:22) was borrowed from Deut 8:2. The subsequent account of the Israelites coming to a place with bitter water (Exod 15:23-26) and of Yahweh only later giving them sweet water (מים), springs (עינת), and palm trees (Exod 15:25.27), in order to test (נסה) them whether they will keep (שׁמר) his commandments (מצותיו: Exod 15:25-26), narratively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh tested the Israelites in the wilderness (Deut 8:2), in order to give them brooks of water, springs, and fruits in abundance at a later time (Deut 8:7-8).

The subsequent account of the Israelites suffering from hunger (רעב) in the wilderness (Exod 16:1-3) and of Yahweh feeding (אכל) them in the wilderness (במדבר) with something or manna (מן) like bread (לחם), which they did not know (לא + ידעו) before, in order to test them (נסה + למען) whether they will follow his law (especially the commandment to keep the Sabbath) or not (ים־לא: Exod 16:4-35),[23] is based on the motifs of Deut 8:3.16.[24] The idea of the Israelites as slowly learning, from the particular features of manna, to observe the commandment to keep the Sabbath (Exod 16:16-30; cf. 16:32-34) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that Yahweh taught the Israelites in the wilderness as a parent teaches his son (Deut 8:5).

The account concerning the fact that there was no water (אין מים) in the wilderness for the Israelites (Exod 17:1-4) and concerning Yahweh as bringing (יצא) water (מים) from the rock (צור: Exod 17:5-6) is based on the Deuteronomic motif borrowed from Deut 8:15 (cf. also 32:13).[25]

---

22 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 460.

23 Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, 'On Learning Spiritual Disciplines: A Reading on Exodus 16', in J. G. McConville and K. Möller (eds.), *Reading the Law*, Festschrift G. J. Wenham (LHBOTS 461; T&T Clark: New York · London 2007), 213-227 (esp. 213-223).

24 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 190; J. A. Wagenaar, 'The Cessation of Manna: Editorial Frames for the Wilderness Wandering in Exodus 16,35 and Joshua 5,10-12', *ZAW* 112 (2000) 192-209 (esp. 198).

25 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 195.

3.9 Defeating Amalek not with the might of hands (Exod 17:8-16; cf. Deut 8:17-9:3)

The combination of the motifs of defeating Anak/Amalek and of doing this not with the might of hands (Exod 17:8-16) originates from Deut 8:17-9:3.

In particular, the name of Amalek (עמלק: Exod 17:8-16) alludes to that of Anak (ענק: Deut 9:2) by means of internymic deviation.[26] The use of this literary procedure in Exod 17:8-16 was necessary for substituting the reference to the sons of Anak, who dwelt in Canaan (Deut 9:2; cf. 1:28; cf. also 2:10-11.21), with the Deuteronomic account of the battle with the sons of Amalek (cf. Deut 25:17-19),[27] which suited the context of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness (Exod 17:8-16).

In his reworking of the battle account Deut 25:18 the author of Exodus added the motif of Yahweh's help, in order to illustrate the ideas of the hypotext Deut 8:17-9:3. In particular, the description of Moses' hand (יד), which took the staff of God (Exod 17:9), which was lifted up but also let down (Exod 17:11), and which grew heavy and had to be held up in order to be steady (Exod 17:12), so that Joshua and his group of chosen men could defeat Amalek (Exod 17:13; cf. 17:9), in a narrative way illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Israel acquired its power not with the might of its hand (Deut 8:17).

The statement concerning Joshua as remembering that Yahweh will blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven (מחה את־זכר עמלק מתחת השמים: Exod 17:14) was borrowed from Deut 25:19. The related thought that this remembrance should last from generation to generation in the forms of a book, a

---

26 For a detailed description of the procedure of internymic deviation, which is characteristic of many intentionally hypertextual writings (cf. e.g. 'Og in Deut 3:1-13 from Gog in Ezek 38:2-39:11), see W. G. Müller, 'Interfigurality: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures', in H. F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (Research in Text Theory: Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 1991), 101-121 (esp. 104-105). Cf. also B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 238 n. 35, 257 n. 87, 263 n. 107; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 99.

27 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 203, 207; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2002), 621; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1985), 303-305.

prophecy, an altar, and a curse (Exod 17:14-16) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not forget to defeat Amalek even when Yahweh will give them rest from all their enemies all around in the land of Canaan (Deut 25:19). However, in his pacific reworking of this Deuteronomic militant idea (Deut 25:19),[28] the author of Exodus stated that making war against Amalek should be regarded as Yahweh's and not the Israelites' task (Exod 17:14.16).[29] In this way, the author of Exodus once again deconstructed the Deuteronomic ideology of holy war.

3.10 Not because of your righteousness (Exod 18; cf. Deut 9:4-6)

The issue of Moses' problems with righteousness, which is the main theme of the bipartite story Exod 18, originates from Deut 9:4-6.

The first account in this story (Exod 18:1-12) presents the morally dubious behaviour of Moses, who dismissed his wife together with her two sons (Exod 18:2-4). Against this negative background, the conversion of Jethro to Yahwism (Exod 18:1.5-12)[30] should be regarded as caused by Yahweh's greatness (Exod 18:1.8-11) and not by Moses' righteousness or the uprightness of his heart (cf. Deut 9:5).

The second account (Exod 18:13-27) presents Moses as executing justice only in a limited way (esp. Deut 18:14.18.22.26). In order to illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' limited righteousness (Deut 9:4-6), the author of Exodus used the Deuteronomic story about Moses as appointing commanders

---

28 G. Hepner, *Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel* (StBL 78; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2010), 802-817 suggests the reverse direction of literary dependence (from Exod 17:8-16 to Deut 25:17-19), but he nevertheless acknowledges the fact that the Amalek narrative in Exod 17:8-16 is somewhat surprisingly followed in Exod 18 by a reference to Moses' positive attitude towards foreigners (ibid. 811-812).

29 Cf. J. I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1987), 237; T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 395-396.

30 Cf. C. Frevel, '"Jetzt habe ich erkannt, dass YHWH größer ist als alle Götter": Ex 18 und seine kompositionsgeschichtliche Stellung im Pentateuch', *BZ*, NF 47 (2003) 3-22 (esp. 11-14).

over the people (Deut 1:9-18).[31] Originally, in the context of preparing the Israelites for conquering the land of Canaan in a proper way (cf. Deut 1:6-8.19-21), this story had a predominantly military meaning (esp. Deut 1:15; cf. 20:9).[32] On the other hand, in Exod 18:21.25 the unnatural, military (and not kin-based) division of the Israelites into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (cf. Deut 1:15) is quite surprising.[33] In order to illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' limited righteousness (צדקה: Deut 9:4-6), in his reworking of the Deuteronomic story Deut 1:9-18 the author of Exodus omitted, among others, the reference to the Israelites as executing justice (צדק: Deut 1:16; diff. Exod 18:22.26). Moreover, in order to illustrate the same idea, the author of Exodus replaced the internal, cognitive-ethical virtues of the officers' hearts (Deut 1:13), qualities which could be regarded as pointing to their own righteousness, with more external and relational ones, which are based on obedience to the imparted divine law (Exod 18:21.25; cf. 18:20).

3.11 Covenant at Mount Sinai (Exod 19-31; cf. Deut 9:7-11)

The story about the covenant at Mount Sinai/Horeb (Exod 19-31) is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 9:7-11 with additional use of several other texts.

In particular, the opening, narratively rather superfluous remark concerning the Israelites as going out (יצא) of the land of Egypt (מארץ מצרים) and concerning the day (יום) of their coming (באה) to the mountain of the covenant (Exod 19:1)[34] echoes the opening Deuteronomic statement Deut 9:7. The geographic name

---

31 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 215-219, 460.

32 Cf. ibid. 215-217; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 21-22; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2004), 20.

33 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 213; W. C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 632-633; C. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 425 n. 80, 428.

34 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 438; J. I. Lawlor, 'The "At-Sinai Narrative": Exodus 18-Numbers 1', *BBR* 21 (2011) 23-42 (esp. 30). *Pace* W. Oswald, *Israel am Gottesberg: Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund* (OBO 159; Universitätsverlag: Freiburg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 1998), 49 the text of Exod 19:1 (diff. 12:3.6.18; 16:1; 40:2.17; Num 1:1; 10:11) does not refer to a particular day in Israel's calendar.

Sinai, as denoting the place of Yahweh's first covenant with Israel (Exod 19:1-2 etc.), was borrowed from Deut 33:2 and used instead of the Deuteronomic, symbolic name Horeb (Deut 9:8; cf. Exod 17:6; 33:6; cf. also 3:1).

The motif of Moses going up (עלה) to the mountain (הר) of the covenant (Exod 19:3.20; 24:12-18) originates from Deut 9:9.[35] Likewise, the motif of Yahweh making (כרת) his covenant (ברית) with all Israel at the mountain (Exod 19:5; 24:7-8) was borrowed from Deut 9:9. In Exod 19:3-24:11 the author of Exodus elaborated the latter motif with the use of much Deuteronomic and other, especially Mesopotamian,[36] paraenetic and legal material, which rhetorically illustrates the idea of a covenant made with the whole people (esp. Deut 5:2-31 in Exod 19:3-20:21).[37]

The motif of Moses going up to the mountain and remaining there in order to be given the tablets of stone (לחת האבן: Exod 24:12) originates from Deut 9:9 (cf. 9:10-11).[38] Likewise, the motif of Moses remaining on the mountain forty days and forty nights (ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה: Exod 24:18) originates from Deut 9:9 (cf. 9:11). The related thought that afterwards Yahweh gave to (ויתן אל) Moses the tablets (לחת) of the testimony, that is two tablets of stone (שני לחת + אבן), which were written with the finger of God (כתבים באצבע אלהים: Exod 31:18), was borrowed from Deut 9:10-11. Like in the preceding section Exod 19:3-24:11, in Exod 24:12-31:18 the author of Exodus elaborated the priestly motif of Moses remaining on the mountain with Yahweh alone (Deut 9:9-11). The author of Exodus made it with the use of numerous cultic motifs (Exod 24:13-31:17), mainly borrowed from Ezek 40-46, which illustrate the thought that the tribe of Levi was separated and called to carry the ark of the covenant of

---

35 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 274.

36 Cf. R. Rothenbusch, *Die kasuistische Rechtssammlung im 'Bundesbuch' (Ex 21,2-11.18-22,16) und ihr literarischer Kontext im Licht altorientalischer Parallelen* (AOAT 259; Ugarit: Münster 2000), 221-398; D. P. Wright, *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi* (Oxford University: New York 2009), *passim*; E. Otto, 'Das Bundesbuch und der "Kodex" Hammurapi: Das biblische Recht zwischen positiver und subversiver Rezeption von Keilinschriftrecht', *ZABR* 16 (2010) 1-26 (esp. 10-18).

37 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 270-286, 459; id., *A Law Book for the Diaspora: Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code* (Oxford University: New York [et al.] 2003), 173-175.

38 Cf. id., *Life*, 274.

Yahweh, to stand before Yahweh,[39] to minister him, and to bless in his name (Deut 10:8-9; cf. 10:1-6).

3.12 Moulded calf and propitiation, Moses' prayer for Israel, and the renewal of the covenant concerning the land of Canaan (Exod 32-34; cf. Deut 9:12-11:28)

The combination of the motifs of the sin of making a moulded calf, Moses' propitiation for it, faithfulness of the tribe of Levi, Moses' prolonged prayer for Israel, renewal of the covenant, and covenantal blessing and faithfulness in the land of Canaan (Exod 32-34) originates from Deut 9:12-11:28.[40]

In particular, the account of the Israelites' sin of making (עשׂה) a moulded calf (עגל מסכה) at Mount Sinai (Exod 32:1-6) is based on Deut 9:16. Yahweh's statement directed to (אל) Moses, 'Go down, for your people whom you brought up from the land of Egypt have acted corruptly; they have turned aside quickly from the way which I commanded them; they have made themselves a moulded image' (מסכה + סרו מהר מן־הדרך אשר צויתם עשׂו להם + מצרים + כי שׁחת עמך אשר + רד: Exod 32:7-8), was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 9:12.[41] Likewise, the subsequent statement that Yahweh said to (ויאמר יהוה אל) Moses, 'I have seen this people, and indeed it is a stiff-necked people' (ראיתי את־העם הזה והנה

39 For this reason, the text which concerns the construction of the ark and of other signs of Israel's presence before Yahweh (Exod 25:10-40) is located in Exodus before the text which concerns the construction of the tabernacle (Exod 26), in difference to Exod 36:8-38 and Exod 37, where the Deuteronomic hypotext Deut 11:29-12:12, which mainly refers to the sanctuary, suggested the reverse thematic order. Cf. also the different relative location of the texts concerning priests in Exod 28-29 (in the middle of the section Exod 25-31) and in Exod 39-40 (at the end of the section Exod 35-40).

40 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 697-698, 719-720.

41 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 308, 311; M. Konkel, *Sünde und Vergebung: Eine Rekonstruktion der Redaktionsgeschichte der hinteren Sinaiperikope (Exodus 32-34) vor dem Hintergrund aktueller Pentateuchmodelle* (FAT 58; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2008), 153-154; V. Sénéchal, *Rétribution et intercession dans le Deutéronome* (BZAW 408; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 298-301, 374-375.

(עם־קשה־ערף הוא) […] ‘and I will make you a great nation’ (ואעשׂה אותך לגוי: Exod 32:9-10), was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 9:13-14.[42]

Moses’ intercessory prayer to Yahweh for ‘your people whom you brought out of Egypt with great power and a mighty hand’ (עמך + אשׁר + הוצאת + מצרים + ביד חזקה + גדל: Exod 32:11) was borrowed from Deut 9:26.[43] Similarly, the statement concerning the Egyptians saying (יאמרו) that Yahweh brought the Israelites out to kill them (Exod 32:12) is a reworking of Deut 9:28.[44] Moses’ request, ‘Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants’ (זכר + לאברהם ליצחק + עבדיך: Exod 32:13), was likewise borrowed from Deut 9:27.[45] Accordingly, in Exod 32 the author of Exodus conflated several Deuteronomic references to Moses’ priestly activity (Deut 9:12-17.18-19.20.21.22.23.24-29) into one simple account (Exod 32:11-13).[46]

The statement that Moses turned (פנה) and went down (ירד) from the mountain (מן־ההר), while the two tablets (ושׁני לחת) of the testimony were in his hand (יד: Exod 32:15), was borrowed from Deut 9:15.[47] The remark concerning the tablets (לחת) which were written by God (כתב + אלהים: Exod 32:16) is based on Deut 9:10.

The idea of Moses as seeing (ראה) the calf (עגל: Exod 32:19) originates from Deut 9:16. The subsequent thought that Moses threw (שׁלך) the tablets (לחת) from his hands (יד) and broke (שׁבר) them (Exod 32:19) originates from the subsequent text Deut 9:17.[48] The statement concerning Moses as taking (לקח) the calf (את־העגל) which they made (עשׂה + אשׁר), burning it with fire (באשׁ + שׂרף), grinding it to powder (טחן עד אשׁר־דק), and throwing it to water (Exod 32:20) originates from Deut 9:21.[49] The related statement concerning the sin of Aaron (Exod 32:21; cf. 32:1-5.22-25.35) originates from Deut 9:20.

---

42 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 308, 311; M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 154; V. Sénéchal, *Rétribution*, 301, 374-376.

43 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 312; M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 155. *Pace* Y. H. Chung, *The Sin of the Calf: The Rise of the Bible’s Negative Attitude Toward the Golden Calf* (LHBOTS 523; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 41 who surprisingly (in the context of Deut 9:25-26.28) states, ‘In Deuteronomy, the impression is not created that the people’s fate is at stake, or that they are on the verge of destruction’ (but see ibid. 76).

44 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 312; M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 155; V. Sénéchal, *Rétribution*, 381-382.

45 Cf. M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 155; V. Sénéchal, *Rétribution*, 381.

46 Cf. M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 155-162.

47 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 315.

48 Cf. ibid. 303, 315.

49 Cf. ibid. 306-307, 315; T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 699.

The motif of faithfulness of the tribe of Levi (לוי) to Yahweh (Exod 32:26-29) was borrowed from Deut 10:8-9.[50] The motif of Moses' propitiation for Israel's sin (חטא: Exod 32:30-35) was borrowed from Deut 9:18.27. The idea of Yahweh as blotting out (מחה) the sinners (Exod 32:33; cf. 32:32) was borrowed from Deut 9:14.

The accounts of Moses' prayer both in the tent of meeting (Exod 33:1-11) and on a rock (Exod 33:12-23) illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of Moses' prolonged intercessory prayer for the sinful Israelites (Deut 9:22-29). The motif of Yahweh's command to go up (עלה) to the land (ארץ) which he swore to give (נתן) to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 33:1-3) was borrowed from Deut 9:23.27. The idea of Yahweh as taking the Israelites' obstinacy (קשה) into consideration (Exod 33:3.5) was borrowed from Deut 9:27. The additional motifs of the tent of meeting, the pillar of cloud which stood at the entrance to the tent, and Joshua who came together with Moses to the tent, motifs which illustrate the idea of Moses' priestly prayer (Exod 33:7-11), originate from Deut 31:14-15 (cf. earlier Hos 12:10). The motif of Israel as Yahweh's people (עמך: Exod 33:13) was borrowed from Deut 9:29.

The account of the renewal of the covenant, which concerned Yahweh's blessing and Israel's faithfulness in the land of Canaan (Exod 34), illustrates the main ideas of Deut 10:1-11:28. The opening statement that Yahweh said to (אמר + יהוה אל) Moses, 'Hew for yourself two tablets of stone like the first ones' (פסל־לך שני־לחת אבנים כראשנים), and that Yahweh should write (כתב) 'on the tablets the words that were on the first tablets, which you broke' (על־הלחת את־הדברים אשר היו על־הלחת הראשנים אשר שברת: Exod 34:1), was borrowed from Deut 10:1-2.[51] The subsequent ideas of Moses as hewing two tablets of stone like the first ones (פסל שני־לחת אבנים כראשנים), and as going up (עלה) to the mountain (הר) with the two tablets in his hands (שני + לחת + ביד: Exod 34:4; cf. 34:2), were borrowed from Deut 10:3. The idea of the renewal of the covenant, again based on ten words given by Yahweh, words which refer mainly to the future dwelling in the land of Canaan (Exod 34:10-27), is a result of a conflation of the short

---

50 Cf. T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, 699-700. It should be noted that in the case of Exod 32:26-29 religiously motivated violence (which is prominent here especially in comparison with Deut 10:8-9) is directed not against the Canaanites but against sinful Israelites. In the political situation of the Persian province of Samaria *c.*400 BC, the author of Exodus evidently could not hope for Israel's war against the Gentiles, but he could hope for some internal 'cleansing' of Israel.

51 Cf. M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 238.

account Deut 10:4-5 with the covenantal instructions and blessings Deut 11:8-28. In Exod 34:11-26 the author of Exodus illustrated the idea of the renewed covenant, which refers to the land of Canaan, with several Deuteronomic instructions, especially taken from Deut 7:1-5; 15:19; 16:1.3.8-10.13.16-17.[52] The idea of Moses as remaining on the mountain forty days and forty nights (ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה: Exod 34:28) originates from Deut 10:10. This idea was conflated with that of Moses as neither eating bread nor drinking water (לחם לא אכל ומים לא שתה: Deut 9:9; cf. also 9:18).

3.13 Pan-Israelite sanctuary of Yahweh (Exod 35-40; cf. Deut 11:29-12:12)

The story and the instructions concerning making one, pan-Israelite sanctuary of Yahweh (Exod 35-40) result from a reworking of the Deuteronomic instructions concerning the place of proper worship of Yahweh in Canaan (Deut 11:29-12:12).

In particular, the idea of offerings (תרומה) as brought to the sanctuary (Exod 35:4-36:7) was borrowed from Deut 12:6.11 (cf. 12:17). Likewise, the idea of the Israelites as bringing freewill offerings (נדבה) to the sanctuary (Exod 35:29-36:3) was borrowed from Deut 12:6 (cf. 12:17).

The idea of Yahweh as calling craftsmen from the tribes of Judah and Dan (Exod 35:30-35; cf. 31:1-11; 36:1-2; 37:1-38:23), which are the southernmost and the northernmost from among the tribes of Israel, illustrate the Deuteronomic idea that the unique sanctuary of Yahweh should be located in central Canaan (Deut 11:29-30; 12:5-11). Moreover, the particular choice of the tribes of Judah and Dan, which had their own Yahwistic sanctuaries in Jerusalem and in Dan, narratively suggests that these tribes should abandon their places of worship and contribute to worshipping Yahweh in the central sanctuary in the region of Shechem (cf. also Deut 27:12-13; Judg 17-18).

The idea of Moses as putting the ark of the testimony ‘there’ (שׂוּם + שָׁם), that is in the sanctuary (Exod 40:3), originates from the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as putting his name ‘there’ (Deut 12:5; cf. 12:21). Likewise, the idea of the cloud as resting (שׁכן) on the tent of meeting (Exod 40:35) originates from the

52 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 355; M. Konkel, *Sünde*, 224-228.

Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh's name as resting in the sanctuary (Deut 12:5.11).

In Exod 35-40 the author of Exodus illustrated the idea of making the pan-Israelite sanctuary of Yahweh. He made it with the use of several motifs which were borrowed from the thematically related, prophetic vision of one temple of Yahweh for all Israel (Ezek 40-46; cf. also Deut 10:1.3.6.8). By means of these motifs, the author of Exodus suggested that the relatively small, wooden tabernacle in the wilderness (Exod 35-40; cf. Exod 25-31) was only a preparatory sign of the real temple, which should be erected in the land of Canaan (Ezek 40-46).

3.14 Proper way of offering sacrifices (Lev 1-9; cf. Deut 12:13-28)

The introductory section of the book of Leviticus, which deals with the proper way of offering sacrifices to Yahweh (Lev 1-9), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 12:13-28.

In particular, the opening fragment concerning burnt offerings (עלה: Lev 1:1-17; cf. 6:1-6; 7:8) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic instructions Deut 12:13-14 (cf. 12:15-16). The subsequent section concerning cereal offerings flavoured with oil (Lev 2:1-16; cf. 6:7-16; 7:9-10) is a reworking of the subsequent Deuteronomic text concerning offering tithes of grain and oil (Deut 12:17). Likewise, the subsequent section concerning offerings of herds (בקר: Lev 3:1-5) is a reworking of the Deuteronomic text concerning offering animals of the Israelites' herds (Deut 12:17). The subsequent section concerning offerings of flocks (צאן: Lev 3:6-16) is a reworking of the Deuteronomic text concerning offering animals of the Israelites' flocks (Deut 12:17). The instruction concerning not eating blood (דם לא תאכלו: Lev 3:17) was borrowed from Deut 12:16.

The section concerning sin offerings (חטאת) and guilt offerings (אשם: Lev 4:1-5:26; cf. 6:17-7:7), which is located after those concerning burnt offerings and cereal offerings (Lev 1-2), alludes to Ezekiel's statements concerning these particular types of sacrifices (Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; cf. 46:20). The subsequent section concerning peace offerings, votive gifts (נדר), and freewill offerings (תרומה), which should be eaten (אכל) in the sanctuary in the state of cleanness (טהור) and not in the state of uncleanness (טמא), and which should be partly destined for the priests (Lev 7:11-34; cf. 7:35-38), is a reworking of the

Deuteronomic text concerning these types of offerings (Deut 12:17-19; cf. 12:20-22). The repeated instruction concerning not eating blood (לא אכל + דם: Lev 7:26-27) was borrowed from Deut 12:23-25.

The section concerning priestly service in the tent of meeting, in particular involving offering burnt sacrifices (עלה), pouring the blood (דם) of the sacrifices (זבח) on the altar (על־מזבח), and eating (אכל) the flesh (בשׂר) of them (Lev 8-9; esp. 9:16.18; 8:31), is a reworking of the Deuteronomic instructions concerning offering sacrifices in the sanctuary (Deut 12:26-27). The concluding, somewhat surprising statement concerning doing everything as Moses commanded (צוה: Lev 9:21; diff. 8:4 etc.)[53] alludes to Deut 12:28.

3.15 Punishing sons who engaged in illicit worship, proper way of mourning, maintaining holiness, and not eating detestable things (Lev 10; cf. Deut 12:29-14:3)

The sequence of the themes of punishing sons who engaged in illicit worship, proper way of mourning, protecting holiness, and not eating detestable things (Lev 10) originates from Deut 12:29-14:3.

In particular, the story about divine fire which killed (מות) Aaron's sons (בן), Mishael and Elzaphan's brothers (אח), who engaged in strange, illicit worship (זר: Lev 10:1; cf. Is 17:10; 43:12; Deut 32:16),[54] so that all Israel (ישׂראל + כל) was greatly afraid (Lev 10:1-5; cf. 10:6), illustrates one of the main ideas of the Deuteronomic text Deut 12:29-13:19. In his reworking of this Deuteronomic text, the author of Leviticus substituted the instruction concerning punishing such sons with the penalty of death (Deut 13:10-11) with the idea of Yahweh as directly killing them (Lev 10:2; cf. 10:6).

---

53 Cf. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1991), 586; C. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT 2.25; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2007), 596.

54 Cf. R. S. Hess, 'Leviticus 10:1: Strange Fire and an Odd Name', *BBR* 12 (2002) 187-198; R. Rendtorff, *Leviticus*, vol. 1, *Leviticus 1,1 – 10,20* (BKAT 3/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004), 304, 308-309; T. M. Willis, *Leviticus* (AOTC; Abington: Nashville 2009), 93-95.

The subsequent instructions concerning proper way of mourning the deceased relatives, which involved not letting hair grow in a strange way and not tearing garments, because of (כי) being consecrated to Yahweh (Lev 10:6-7), illustrates the main idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:1-2a. Likewise, the subsequent instructions concerning maintaining holiness (קדשׁ) in Israel (Lev 10:8-15) illustrate the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:2. The subsequent, somewhat enigmatic account of not eating (אכל) a sin offering (Lev 10:16-20)[55] may allude to the subsequent Deuteronomic instruction concerning not eating abhorrent things (Deut 14:3).

3.16 Clean and unclean animals, and holiness of the Israelites (Lev 11-20; cf. Deut 14:4-21)

The section concerning clean and unclean animals, as well as holiness of the Israelites (Lev 11-20), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:4-21.

In particular, the opening statement, ‘These are the animals which you may eat’ (אשר תאכלו + זאת: Lev 11:2), was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 14:4. The subsequent instruction concerning any animal having a divided hoof and showing a division of the hoofs, and chewing the cud (כל + מפרסת פרסה ושסעת שׁסע + פרסת מעלה גרה בבהמה אתה תאכלו: Lev 11:3) was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 14:6. The subsequent, tripartite instruction concerning not eating these animals which chew the cud or have a divided hoof: the camel, the rock hyrax, and the hare, because they chew the cud but do not have a divided hoof, and hence they are unclean for the Israelites (Lev 11:4-6), is an evident elaboration of Deut 14:7. The subsequent instruction concerning the swine (Lev 11:7-8) was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 14:8. The subsequent instruction concerning cleanness of water creatures (Lev 11:9-12) is an elaboration of the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 14:9-10.[56] The subsequent list of birds which should not be eaten (Lev 11:13-19) was almost verbatim borrowed from Deut 14:12-18. The subsequent, detailed instruction concerning cleanness of flying insects (Lev

---

55 Cf. W. H. Bellinger, Jr., *Leviticus and Numbers* (NIBCOT 3; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2001), 66-68; C. Nihan, *From Priestly*, 598-600; T. M. Willis, *Leviticus*, 97-98.

56 Cf. C. Nihan, *From Priestly*, 285-286.

11:20-23) is an elaboration of the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 14:19.[57] Likewise, the subsequent instructions concerning uncleanness of carcasses (נבלה) and of other animals (Lev 11:24-47) constitute an elaboration of the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 14:21a.

The subsequent, detailed instructions of various, partly Deuteronomic origin,[58] which concern cleanness and holiness of the Israelites (Lev 12:1-20:24; esp. 12:4; 14:13; 16:2-34; 19:2.8.24; 20:3.7-8; cf. also 11:44-45), illustrate the Deuteronomic thought that Israel is a holy (קדש) people to Yahweh (Deut 14:21).

The summarizing instruction concerning making a distinction between the clean animal (בהמה) and the unclean (טמא), and between the unclean bird (עוף טמא) and the clean (טהר: Lev 20:25) originates from Deut 14:4-8.11-20. The subsequent statement concerning the Israelites as being holy (קדש) for Yahweh (Lev 20:26) originates from the subsequent Deuteronomic text Deut 14:21. Consequently, the concluding instruction concerning an abhorrent act (Lev 20:27) probably also alludes to the concluding Deuteronomic text concerning not boiling a kid in its mother's milk (Deut 14:21).

---

57 *Pace* J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 699 the logic of the Deuteronomic instructions Deut 14:19-20, namely a general permission concerning clean flying creatures with an exception concerning swarming flying creatures, is similar to that of Deut 14:4-8.9-10.11-18, but in the case of Deut 14:19-20 the general permission (Deut 14:20) follows and not precedes the exception (Deut 14:19) in order to introduce the conclusive prohibitions Deut 14:21. Cf. also J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1992), 156; C. Nihan, *From Priestly*, 286.

58 Cf. R. Achenbach, 'Das Heiligkeitsgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuchredaktion', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (BETL 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 145-175 (esp. 153-155); R. Albertz, 'From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (BZAR 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 53-69 (esp. 57); C. Nihan, 'Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *Foreigner*, 111-134 (esp. 117).

3.17 Priests and offerings (Lev 21-22; cf. Deut 14:22-29)

The section concerning priests and offerings (Lev 21-22) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 14:22-29.

In particular, the instructions concerning priestly holiness (קדשׁ) and ministry (Lev 21) originate from a conflation of the Deuteronomic ideas of the Israelites being holy for Yahweh (Deut 14:21) and of the sanctuary of Yahweh (Deut 14:23; cf. 14:24-26). The particular idea of not profaning the name (שׁם) of Yahweh (Lev 21:6; 22:2.32) is a reworking of the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh's name as dwelling in the sanctuary (Deut 14:23-24). The instructions concerning the priests' share in the sacrifices which are eaten (אכל) in the sanctuary (Lev 22:1-16) originate from the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 14:27 (cf. 14:23.26; cf. also 14:28-29). The instructions concerning offering animals, both of herds (בקר) and flocks (צאן), without blemish (Lev 22:17-30; esp. 22:19.21) allude to the Deuteronomic instructions concerning offering animals, both of herds and flocks (Deut 14:23.26; cf. 15:21; 17:1).

3.18 Festivals of Yahweh during the year, giving just and impartial judgements, and heptads of years (Lev 23-25; cf. Deut 15:1-16:20)

The section concerning festivals of Yahweh during the year, giving just and impartial judgements, and heptads of years (Lev 23-25) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 15:1-16:20.

In particular, the instructions concerning celebrating the Passover to Yahweh (פסח ליהוה), as well as the festival of unleavened bread (חג המצות: Lev 23:5-8), originate from a summarizing and systematizing reworking of the Deuteronomic text concerning the Passover, that is the festival of unleavened bread (Deut 16:1-8; cf. 16:16).[59] The resulting calculation of the time of

59 Cf. E. Otto, 'Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitsgesetz Levitikus 17-26', in H.-J. Fabry and H.-W. Jüngling (eds.), *Levitikus als Buch* (BBB 119; Philo: Berlin 1999), 125-196 (esp. 153-156) [also in id., *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Schriften* (BZAR 9; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 46-106 (esp. 70-72)].

celebrating the festival of unleavened bread ('on the fifteenth day… seven days': Lev 23:6; diff. Deut 16:3-4.8)[60] is in fact rather strange.[61]

The instructions concerning offering cereal and animal first fruits (Lev 23:9-14; cf. 23:17: בכורים ליהוה; cf. also 23:18-20) originate from a reworking of the Deuteronomic instructions concerning offering firstlings (Deut 15:19-23).

The detailed instructions concerning counting (ספר) seven (שׁבע) weeks and celebrating the festival of weeks (Lev 23:15-22), during which the poor and the stranger (גר) should not be forgotten, instructions which are supplemented with the directives concerning two other festivals (Lev 23:23-32), originate from the Deuteronomic text Deut 16:9-12.[62]

The subsequent instructions concerning the festival of booths (חג הסכות), which should last seven days (שׁבעת ימים) and which should be a time of common rejoicing (שׂמח: Lev 23:33-36.39-43), originate from the Deuteronomic text Deut 16:13-15.[63] The concluding instructions concerning continual presence of the Israelites' gifts before Yahweh (פני יהוה: Lev 24:1-9) originate from a reworking of the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' regular presence and gifts before the face of Yahweh (Deut 16:16-17).

The story and the instructions concerning giving just and impartial judgements (משׁפט: Lev 24:10-23) illustrate the main idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 16:18-20. The idea of judging a son of an Egyptian father and of an Israelite women (Lev 24:10-11), as well as that of having one law for the alien and for the citizen (Lev 24:16.22), ideas which are exemplified with the use of a set of commonly accepted legal rules (Lev 24:15-21), illustrate the Deuteronomic text Deut 16:19. The additional idea of being a son of an Egyptian man and of a woman from the northernmost tribe of Dan (Lev 24:10-11) may allude both to the idea of judging (דן) and to the motif of all the tribes of Israel in the Promised Land (Deut 16:18.20). Likewise, the somewhat strange name Dibri (דברי: Lev 24:11) probably alludes to the idea of the words (דברי) of the righteous (Deut

---

60 Cf. A. Ruwe, *„Heiligkeitsgesetz" und „Priesterschrift": Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,1-26,2* (FAT 26; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 1999), 305.

61 Cf. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3B; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 2001), 1975-1976.

62 Cf. E. Otto, 'Innerbiblische', 158-161 [also in id., *Tora*, 73-76]; C. Nihan, 'Israel's Festival Calendars in Leviticus 23, Numbers 28-29 and the Formation of "Priestly" Literature', in T. Römer (ed.), *Leviticus and Numbers*, 177-231 (esp. 215-216).

63 Cf. C. Nihan, 'Israel's Festival', 216-217.

16:19). The somewhat surprising (in the context of the wilderness) idea of putting in custody (Lev 24:12)[64] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of appointing judges in the gates of Israel's cities (Deut 16:18).

The instructions concerning heptads of years (Lev 25) are based on those of Deut 15:1-18.[65] In his reworking of this Deuteronomic text, the author of Leviticus elaborated the instructions concerning the seventh year (שנה השבעית: Deut 15:12) and applied them to not sowing fields (Lev 25:1-7.18-22; esp. 25:4.20), but he also reformulated the instructions concerning remission of debts related to property, poor ones, and slaves in the seventh year (Deut 15:1-18) into the economically more realistic ones concerning remission of debts related to property, poor ones, and slaves in the jubilee, that is the fiftieth, year (Lev 25:8-17.23-55).[66]

3.19 Not setting up sacred pillars, and respect for proper worship (Lev 26:1-2; cf. Deut 16:21-17:1)

The combination of the motifs of not setting up sacred pillars and of respect for proper worship (Lev 26:1-2) originates from Deut 16:21-17:1.

In particular, the prohibition of making idols or carved images (Lev 26:1) originates from the Deuteronomic prohibition of planting wooden asherahs (Deut 16:21). The subsequent prohibition of setting up a sacred pillar (מצבה + לא־תקימו לכם) against the will of 'Yahweh your God' (Lev 26:1) originates from Deut 16:22.

The subsequent instructions concerning proper worship of Yahweh and concerning respect for his sanctuary (Lev 26:2) most probably allude to the Deuter-

---

64 Cf. J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 409; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2110; A. Tronina, *Księga Kapłańska: Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (NKBST 3; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2006), 354.

65 Cf. J. Van Seters, 'Law of the Hebrew Slave: A Continuing Debate', *ZAW* 119 (2007) 169-183 (esp. 177-178); M. Leuchter, 'The Manumission Laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy: The Jeremiah Connection', *JBL* 127 (2008) 635-653 (esp. 636-637, 639-640, 646-648, 652); Y. H. Kim, 'The Jubilee: Its Reckoning and Inception Day', *VT* 60 (2010) 147-151 (esp. 150).

66 Cf. J. Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2007), 141-164.

onomic idea of respecting proper worship of Yahweh in his sanctuary (Deut 17:1).

3.20 Punishment for breaking Yahweh's covenant (Lev 26:3-46; cf. Deut 17:2-7)

The motif of a punishment for breaking Yahweh's covenant (Lev 26:3-46) was borrowed from Deut 17:2-7.

In his hypertextual reworking of Deut 17:2-7, which deals with the case of transgressing Yahweh's covenant (ברית: Deut 17:2), the author of Leviticus first described Yahweh's blessings for Israel's keeping the covenant (Lev 26:3-13). Against this background, with the use of the motifs which were borrowed from Deut 28-30, he described Yahweh's punishments for Israel's breaking his covenant (Lev 26:14-39), and thereafter Yahweh's remembering his covenant (Lev 26:40-46).

3.21 Priestly judgements in difficult cases (Lev 27; cf. Deut 17:8-13)

The section concerning priestly judgements in difficult cases (Lev 27) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 17:8-13.

In particular, the opening formula concerning something that is too difficult to realize (כי יפלא: Lev 27:2) was borrowed from Deut 17:8. The subsequent thought that the priest (הכהן: Lev 27:8.11-12.14.18.21.23) in the sanctuary should give a binding decision for the Israelites in a difficult legal case (Lev 27:3-34) was borrowed from Deut 17:9.12 (cf. 17:10-11).

3.22 Rulers from among brethren in Israel (Num 1-2; cf. Deut 17:14-20)

The list of the Israelite tribes with their rulers (Num 1-2) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 17:14-20.

In particular, the repeated remarks concerning heads of ancestral houses, leaders of Israel's tribes, and heads of thousands in Israel (Num 1:4-17.44; 2:3

etc.) substitute for the earlier, Deuteronomic idea of one king in Israel (Deut 17:14-20). The thought that the men (איש) who functioned as leaders of Israel's tribes were chosen from among the members of the respective tribes (Num 1:4-16.44) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the men who are set as rulers over Israel should be chosen from among brethren (Deut 17:15; cf. 17:20).

The thought that these leaders were subordinated to Moses and Aaron (Num 1:3-19.44), who were presumably Levites (הלוים: Num 1:47-53; 2:17.33), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the ruler in Israel should obey the law as it is explained by the priests, the Levites (Deut 17:18-19). The related idea of the Israelites as doing (עשׂה) according to all that Yahweh commanded (צוה) Moses (Num 1:54; 2:34) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the ruler should do all the words and statutes of the law, that is of the commandment (Deut 17:19-20).

The thought that the military order of the Israelite tribes was directed towards the east (Num 2) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should take possession of the land of Canaan and never return to Egypt (Deut 17:14.16; cf. Judg 1:1-2).[67]

3.23 Priests and Levites (Num 3-10; cf. Deut 18:1-8)

The section concerning the priests and the Levites (Num 3-10) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 18:1-8.

In particular, the introductory fragment concerning the priests (הכהנים: Num 3:1-4) alludes to the remark concerning the priests in Deut 18:1. Likewise, the subsequent section concerning the Levites (הלוים), that is the tribe of Levi (לוי: Num 3:5-4:49), alludes to the subsequent remark concerning the Levites, that is the tribe of Levi, in Deut 18:1 (cf. 18:6-7).

---

67 The recognition of the military strength of the tribe of Judah in Num 1:26-27; 2:3.9 does not imply that the author of the book of Numbers was a Judaean, because a similar idea in the book of Judges (Judg 1:1-20; 20:18) was voiced by someone who was certainly not a Judaean (cf. Judg 1:21; 17:7-18:31; 19:1-2.10-13). According to Num 2:3-31 the tribe of Judah could be regarded as the first militant tribe in Israel (Num 2:3-4.9; cf. 10:14), but the tribe of Ephraim was the secular tribe which was admitted to the closest proximity to the sanctuary of Yahweh, because it always had the ark in front of them (Num 2:17-18.24; cf. 10:21-22).

The subsequent, somewhat surprising text which defines Israel (ישראל) in terms of cleanness (Num 5:1-4)[68] most probably alludes to the subsequent remark concerning ideal Israel in Deut 18:1. The subsequent instructions concerning the priests' share in various offerings which are made by fire to Yahweh (Num 5:5-6:21; esp. 5:8-10.25-26.30; 6:10-12.14-20), in particular their share in the offerings concerning wives (אשה: Num 5:11-31), as well as the priestly blessing in the name of Yahweh (Num 6:22-27), illustrate the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that the priests should eat the offerings which are made by fire (אשה) to Yahweh, because Yahweh is their inheritance (Deut 18:1; cf. 18:2-3). The subsequent account of all Israelites bringing their partly edible offerings to the sanctuary (Num 7; esp. 7:13-16 etc.; cf. 8:1-4) illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that the priests should eat from Yahweh's hereditary portion (presumably, in the wealth of Israel: Deut 18:1; cf. 18:4). The subsequent fragment concerning the separation of the Levites, so that they might stand (עמד) before Yahweh and minister (שרת) Yahweh (Num 8:6-26; esp. 8:13.26), illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic idea (Deut 18:5).

The subsequent fragment concerning celebrating the Passover (Num 9:1-14), that is one of the feasts for which all Israelites should be summoned (cf. Num 10:1-10) to the sanctuary (Lev 23:4-8; cf. Deut 16:1-8.16), as well as the subsequent fragments which refer to all Israelites as being related to Yahweh's presence in the sanctuary (Num 9:15-10:28), allude to the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of coming to the sanctuary of Yahweh (Deut 18:6-7). The subsequent account concerning Moses' relative Hobab and his share, notwithstanding his having his own family, in Yahweh's blessing which was given through the ark of the covenant (Num 10:29-36) illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that the distanced Levites should have a share with their Levitical relatives who minister in the sanctuary, notwithstanding their having their own family possessions (Deut 18:8).

3.24 Destruction of idolaters in Israel (Num 11:1-3; cf. Deut 18:9-14)

The short fragment concerning the destruction of the end of Israel's camp (Num 11:1-3) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 18:9-14.

---

68 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers* (WBC 5; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1984), 53.

According to the presentation of the book of Numbers, the last part of Israel's camp was constituted by the standard of Dan (Num 2:25-31; 10:25-27). Consequently, the destruction of the end of Israel's camp (Num 11:1; cf. 11:2-3) was tantamount to the destruction of the tribe of Dan, which was regarded in Israel's Deuteronomic tradition as an unorthodox tribe because of its having its own sanctuary of Yahweh (cf. Judg 18; Exod 31:6; 35:34; 38:23; cf. also 1 Kgs 12:29-30; 2 Kgs 10:29).

The particular way of punishing them, namely that of Yahweh burning (בער) them with fire (אשׁ) because of their saying evil (רע) against him (Num 11:1; cf. Num 11:2-3), alludes to the presumed way of their sinning (Deut 18:10) and to other Deuteronomic texts which refer to punishing idolaters (Deut 13:6; 17:7). The name Taberah (תבערה: Num 11:3) was borrowed from Deut 9:22.

3.25 Prophets as followers of Moses (Num 11:4-12:16; cf. Deut 18:15-22)

The section concerning prophets regarded as followers of Moses (Num 11:4-12:16) is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 18:15-22.

In particular, the framing account Num 11:4-23.31-35 with the use of the motif of quails and manna (esp. Num 11:4-9.13.18-23.31-33; cf. Exod 16:1-31) etymologically explains the name Kibroth-hattaavah (esp. Num 11:4.34-35), which was borrowed from Deut 9:22, like the name Taberah in the preceding section Num 11:1-3. Moreover, this account is composed with the use of the Deuteronomic motif of Moses not being able (לא־אוכל) to bear (נשׂא) the burden (משׂא) of the Israelites alone (לבדי) and consequently looking for helpers among them (Num 11:11.14.16-17; cf. Deut 1:9-18),[69] which had its proper, original setting in the context of the Israelites' preparations for an organized, military conquest of the land of Canaan (Deut 1:6-21), but which in fact has nothing to do with eating quails (Num 11:4-35). This motif constitutes a narrative background to the story about seventy men of the elders of the people, men who

69 Cf. T. C. Römer, 'L'école deutéronomiste et la formation de la Bible hébraïque', in id. (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (BETL 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 179-193 (esp. 189).

functioned as Moses' helpers and who enjoyed the gift of prophecy (Num 11:24-30).[70]

The thought that these men were chosen from among the Israelites (Num 11:16.24) illustrates the idea of the Deuteronomic texts Deut 18:15.18. Likewise, the idea that Yahweh took of the spirit which was on Moses and put it on the elders (Num 11:17.25) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the future follower of Moses will be like him (Deut 18:15.18). The thought that all the elders prophesied and that all Yahweh's people could be prophets (נביא: Num 11:25-29) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will raise up a prophet like Moses for the Israelites (Deut 18:15.18). Accordingly, in his reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 18:15-18 the author of the book of Numbers substituted the Deuteronomic idea of one future authoritative successor to Moses (Deut 18:15.18-19) with the thought that it was not Joshua who fully realized this prophecy (Num 11:28; cf. 11:25-27), but that elders of Israel may at times fulfil the task of being Moses' authoritative successors (Num 11:16-17.25-27.30), and that the whole people of Israel, guided by the Spirit of Yahweh, should be a faithful follower of Moses (Num 11:29).[71]

The subsequent story about Miriam and Aaron as contesting the authority of Moses (Num 12:1-16) illustrates the main ideas of the subsequent Deuteronomic text Deut 18:19-22. The idea of Yahweh as being angry with them for their disregarding the fact that Yahweh spoke (דבר) directly only to Moses (Num 12:8-9; cf. 12:3.7) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that Yahweh will require account from the person who does not obey the words of the true prophet (Deut 18:19). Moreover, the thought that Miriam, who spoke (דבר) words against Moses (Num 12:1) and suggested that Yahweh spoke (דבר) also to her (Num 12:2), thus wanting to be regarded as a prophet (נביא: Num 12:6; cf. Exod 15:20), ultimately became leprous, and consequently became as one dead (מת: Num 12:10-12; cf. Deut 24:8-9),[72] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the prophet who pre-

---

70 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 217-218, 233-234, 460-461.

71 Cf. T. C. Römer, 'Israel's Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers', in R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker (eds.), *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography*, Festschrift A. G. Auld (VTSup 113; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007), 419-445 (esp. 438-439); R. Achenbach, 'Die Tora und die Propheten im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.', in R. Achenbach, M. Arneth, and E. Otto, *Tora in der Hebräischen Bibel: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte und synchronen Logik diachronen Transformationen* (BZAR 7; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2007), 26-71 (esp. 43).

72 *Pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative*, 263-268.

sumes to speak in Yahweh's name something that Yahweh has not commanded, or who speaks in the name of other gods (understandably, something that is against Moses' law), shall die (Deut 18:20). The subsequent idea that Moses' request was granted by Yahweh (Num 12:13-16) illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic idea that a true prophet can be recognized by the fact that his words are fulfilled (Deut 18:21-22).

3.26 Conquering the land of Canaan, capital punishment for grave sins, remedies for unconscious sins, and making tassels (Num 13-19; cf. Deut 19-22)

The combination of the motifs of conquering the land of Canaan, capital punishment for grave sins, remedies for unconscious sins, and making tassels (Num 13-19) originates from Deut 19-22.

In particular, the story about the failed attempt to conquer the land of Canaan (Num 13-14) was borrowed from Deut 1:22-46[73] and reworked in such a way that it could illustrate at least some of the ideas of Deut 19:1-21:21. After the evident explanatory expansions Num 13:4-16.17-20 (cf. Deut 1:25.28),[74] the surprising remark concerning the spies going as far as Rehob, near Lebo-hamath (Num 13:21),[75] which constituted the northern border of the land of Israel (Am 6:14; Ezek 47:20; 48:1; Josh 13:5; Judg 3:3; Num 34:8),[76] and not simply to Eshcol, which was located near Hebron (Num 13:22-24; 32:9; cf. Deut 1:24; cf. also Gen 13:8; 14:13.24), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should conquer the whole land of Canaan, and not only a part thereof (Deut 19:1.8). The surprising thought that the spies in the conquered land cut down (כרת) a branch of vine (Num 13:23-24),[77] and not simply took in their

---

73 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 373-380.

74 Cf. ibid. 373-374.

75 Cf. H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 2, *Numeri 10,11 – 22,1* (BKAT 4/2; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2003), 106-107; R. Achenbach, 'Die Erzählung von der gescheiterten Landnahme von Kadesch Barnea (Numeri 13-14) als Schlüsseltext der Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuchs', *ZABR* 9 (2003) 56-123 (esp. 84-85).

76 Cf. R. D. Cole, *Numbers* (NAC 3B; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2000), 220; H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 2, 106; L. Schmidt, *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri 10,11-36,13* (ATD 7/2; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004), 44.

77 Cf. R. Achenbach, 'Erzählung', 67.

hands some of the grapes, pomegranates, and figs from the land (Num 13:23; diff. Deut 1:25), alludes to Deut 19:5; 20:19-20. Likewise, the list of the Canaanite nations (Num 13:29) in the explanatory fragment Num 13:28-29 (diff. Deut 1:28; Num 13:31-33) alludes to Deut 19:1; 20:17.

The remark concerning Caleb's short persuasion, which was not based on the authority of Yahweh (Num 13:30; diff. Deut 1:36), presents this Judaean hero (cf. Josh 14:6-15; 15:13-20; Judg 1:20; Num 13:6; 34:19)[78] in a somewhat negative light (cf. Deut 1:41). On the other hand, the remark concerning the dramatic persuasion of the priests Moses and Aaron, together with Joshua and Caleb (in this Israelite–Judaean order: diff. Deut 1:36.38), who said to all Israel (ישׂראל) that the Israelites should not fear (אל־תיראו) their enemies because Yahweh is with them (Num 14:5-9), is evidently based on Deut 20:1-4 (cf. 1:29-31).

After the remark concerning Yahweh's glory, and after the rebuke concerning the Israelites as not believing Yahweh (Num 14:10-11; cf. Deut 1:32-33; 9:23), the motif of Yahweh's anger, Moses' priestly prayer for Israel, and Yahweh's mercy (Num 14:12-21), which was borrowed from Deut 9:14.25-29; 10:10-11 (cf. Nah 1:3; Deut 5:9),[79] illustrates the idea of the priests' role in forgiving Israel's guilt (Deut 21:5.8). The somewhat strange thought that the rebellious Israelites who did not obey the voice (שׁמע בקול) of Yahweh (Num 14:22; cf. Deut 9:23; diff. 1:35) had to die (מות) suddenly in the wilderness already before their sinful, futile attempt to conquer the land of Canaan (Num 14:35.37; diff. Deut 1:40.46; 2:14-16)[80] is a reworking of the Deuteronomic thought that a rebellious son, who obeys neither his father nor his mother nor God, should be stoned and die (Deut 21:18.20-21). The related thought that the Israelites' corpses will lie (נפל) unburied in the wilderness (Num 14:29.32-33; diff. Deut 1:40) alludes to Deut 21:1-3.

The two sets of cultic instructions for the time of the Israelites' arrival in the land of Canaan (Num 15:1-16.17-21; cf. Ezek 45:21-46:15; 44:30) allude to Deut 19:1. The instruction concerning forgiving an unintentional sin of the

---

78 Cf. ibid. 105.

79 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, 152; J. Van Seters, *Life*, 381-382; V. Sénéchal, *Rétribution*, 375-376, 379.

80 Cf. R. Achenbach, 'Erzählung', 110-112, 123; V. Sénéchal, 'Quel horizon d'écriture pour Nb 14,11-25? Essai de sondage des soubassements de cette péricope', in T. Römer (ed.), *Leviticus and Numbers*, 609-629 (esp. 611); D. Volgger, *Und dann wirst du gewiss sterben: Zu den Todesbildern im Pentateuch* (ATSAT 92; EOS: St. Ottilien 2010), 261-264.

whole people of Israel, after their making an offering of a bull and after making atonement (כפר) for Israel (Num 15:22-26), alludes to Deut 21:1-9. The subsequent instruction concerning forgiving only an unintentional sin of an individual person in Israel, after that person made an offering and after a priest made atonement (כפר) for him or her (Num 15:27-31; cf. 15:32-36), illustrates the legal idea of Deut 19:4-13 (cf. 21:8).

The elaborate instruction concerning the Israelites as making (עשׂה) tassels on the corners (כנף + על) of their garments (Num 15:37-41) explains the short Deuteronomic instruction Deut 22:12.

The story about the persons who committed a grave sin (חטא) deserving death (מות), so that the earth opened (אדמה + פצה: Num 16:30-31; diff. ארץ: Num 16:32-34) its mouth and swallowed them up (Num 16:1-35; esp. 16:22.29), with the use of the Deuteronomic motif of the earth opening its mouth and swallowing up Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, the son of Reuben, as well as their households, their tents, and all the substance which was in their possession, in the midst of all Israel (Deut 11:6; cf. also 18:22; diff. Num 16:1), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the person who was condemned to capital punishment should be buried and should not defile the earth (אדמה) in Israel (Deut 21:22-23).

The section Num 17-18 (esp. 17:3.6.13-14.25.28; 18:3.7.13.15.22.32) further illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the priests' role in Israel's avoiding grave sins which deserve death, and consequently in preserving cleanness in Israel (cf. Deut 21:22-23). The particular thought that the staff of Aaron sprouted (Num 17:16-26) may additionally illustrate the thought that the priests help preserve the earth clean (cf. Deut 21:23).

The somewhat strange set of instructions concerning purifying the Israelites, especially those who in the open field (שׂדה) touched one who was slain (חלל), by means of water for purification, a liquid obtained by adding to running water the ashes of a burnt heifer, on which no yoke (על) has been laid and which was killed in the presence of the priest (הכהן), who alone sprinkled (i.e. threw away) its blood (דם), whereupon both the priest and other people who were involved in the rite washed (רחץ) themselves (Num 19; esp. 19:2-4.6-8.16-17),[81] originates from a reworking of the Deuteronomic thought that the sins of the people of Israel may be atoned by means of a heifer which has not pulled with the yoke and

81 Cf. H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 2, 248.

which was killed in the running water of a river,[82] whereupon the priests came, and the people who were involved in the rite washed their hands and declared that their hands did not shed the blood of the one slain who had been found in the open field (Deut 21:1-9).

3.27 Assembly of Yahweh, Edom, making and fulfilling vows, Moab, Balaam, dying for one's own sins, and having no male heirs (Num 20-27; cf. Deut 23-25)

The combination of the motifs of the assembly of Yahweh, Edom, making and fulfilling vows, Moab, Balaam, dying for one's own sins, and having no male heirs (Num 20-27) originates from Deut 23-25.

In particular, the motif of the assembly of Yahweh (קהל יהוה: Num 20:4; cf. 20:2.6.8.10.12; cf. also 16:3; diff. Exod 17:1-7), which is in a quite surprising way (as in the mouth of the rebels) introduced in Num 20:4 (cf. 20:2), was evidently borrowed from Deut 23:2-4.9 and conflated in Num 20:1-13 with Deut 32:51 (cf. also the use of Deut 32:50 in Num 20:22-29). The idea of the Israelites as having neither food nor drink in the wilderness (Num 20:5; diff. Exod 17:3; Num 20:2.8.10-11) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as having neither bread nor water there (Deut 23:5).

The motifs of the inhabitants of Edom, regarded as the Israelites' brothers (אח), and of the Israelites once dwelling among the Egyptians (Num 20:14-21) were borrowed from Deut 23:8[83] and illustrated with the use of the Deuteronomic account Deut 2:4-8 (cf. 1:46).[84] The account of Aaron's death on Mount Hor and of Eleazar his son succeeding him as priest (Num 20:22-29) originates from a conflation of Deut 32:50 with Deut 10:6.

---

82 It is possible that the idea of turning the heifer to ashes (עפר: Num 19:17) originates from that of breaking the heifer's neck (ערף: Deut 21:4.6), by an assimilation to Deut 9:21 (burning the impure object, grinding it to dust, and throwing it to water; cf. Exod 32:20).

83 Cf. W. Oswald, 'Die Revision des Edombildes in Numeri xx 14-21', *VT* 50 (2000) 218-232 (esp. 230-232).

84 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 391-392.

The short story about the Israelites as making a vow to Yahweh (נדר נדר ליהוה) and as fulfilling it (Num 21:1-3) illustrates the idea of the Deuteronomic text Deut 23:22-24 (cf. also 1:44; 20:16-17).

The story about the Israelites as longing for bread and water (לחם + מים) on their way from Egypt (בדרך + ממצרים) and about their being punished with burning serpents (Num 21:4-9) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites had neither bread nor water on their way from Egypt (Deut 23:5), an idea which was conflated with that of the presence of burning serpents in the wilderness (Deut 8:15).[85] The account Num 21:10-20, which presents the Israelites as going through the rocky but divinely watered regions of the brooks of Zered and Arnon, Waheb in Suphah ('giver in the reeds'), the well of Beer ('well'), and the places called Mattanah ('gift') and Nahaliel ('the brook of God'),[86] an account which alludes to Deut 2:13-25 (cf. also 10:6-7),[87] likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas that the Israelites had no water on their way from Egypt (Deut 23:5), but Yahweh gave them water there (Deut 8:15).

The story about the Israelites' conflict with Sihon king of Heshbon and Og king of Bashan (Num 21:21-35), which originates from Deut 2:24-3:7,[88] was somewhat surprisingly supplemented with the motif of war against Moab (Num 21:25-32)[89] in order to allude to the idea of Israel's enmity towards Moab (Deut 23:4-5; cf. Judg 11:26). The subsequent story about the Moabite king as calling Balaam son of Beor (בלעם בן־בעור) from Pethor (פתור), which was located near the River (נהר), to curse Israel, and about Yahweh as turning the curse into a blessing (ברך: Num 22-24), illustrates the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of Deut 23:5-6 (cf. Judg 11:25).[90] Likewise, the story about the Israelites' sin with

---

85 Cf. ibid. 224-226.

86 Cf. H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 2, 331-335.

87 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 159.

88 Cf. A. Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch* (BiSe 58; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1999), 117-119; L. Schmidt, 'Die Ansiedlung von Ruben und Gad im Ostjordanland in Numeri 32,1-38', *ZAW* 114 (2002) 497-510 (esp. 504); R. Albertz, 'Das Buch Numeri jenseits der Quellentheorie: Eine Redaktionsgeschichte von Num 20-24 (Teil I)', *ZAW* 123 (2011) 171-183 (esp. 178-179).

89 Cf. H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 2, 349-351; L. Schmidt, *Numeri 10,11-36,13*, 112-115.

90 Cf. G. Auld, 'Samuel, Numbers and the Yahwist-Question', in J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte (eds.), *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngeren Diskussion* (BZAW 315; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2002), 233-246 (esp. 245) [also in id., *Samuel at the Threshold* (SOTSMS; Ashgate: Hants · Burlington, Vt. 2004), 243-254 (esp. 253)].

the women of Moab, and with the Midianites (Num 25; cf. 22:4.7), with the use of the motifs of the Israelites' sin at/following Baal of Peor (Deut 4:3; cf. Hos 9:10) and of deserving capital punishment for idolatry (Deut 13:2-19) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Moabites as not entering the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:4). Similarly, the account of the census of the congregation of the sons of Israel (Num 26) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:2-4.9; cf. 2:14-16).

The account Num 27:1-11 (cf. 26:33) in a narrative way illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas that the father should die for his own sin (אב + מות + בחטאו: Deut 24:16) and that if someone dies (מות), having no sons (ובן אין לו), his name (שׁם) should not be removed from Israel thanks to his brother (אח: Deut 25:5-10).[91] In his reworking of the latter idea, the author of the book of Numbers substituted the earlier, somewhat crude obligation to take the wife of the deceased brother, in case he had no son (Deut 25:5-10), with the more refined idea of the daughters as being financially independent, legitimate heirs of their deceased father, in case he had no son (Num 27:1-8).[92] The concluding account Num 27:12-23 likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas of the older generation as dying for their own sins (Deut 24:16; cf. 31:14; 32:48-52; 34:9) and of the assembly of Yahweh (Deut 23:2-4.9).

3.28 Burnt offerings, other offerings, vows, and contributions offered in the sanctuary (Num 28-31; cf. Deut 26-28)

The somewhat surprisingly introduced section concerning burnt offerings and other offerings, which should be offered in the sanctuary, and concerning fulfilling vows and offering contributions to the sanctuary (Num 28-31)[93] is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 26-28.

In particular, the elaborate instructions concerning burnt offerings (עלה: Num 28:3-29:39) with the use of the motif of cultic instructions concerning fes-

91 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, 301-302.

92 Cf. ibid. 302-303; H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 3, *Numeri 22,2 – 36,13* (BKAT 4/3; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007), 212.

93 Cf. R. P. Knierim and G. W. Coats, *Numbers* (FOTL 4; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2005), 281; H. Seebass, *Numeri*, vol. 3, 238-239.

tival offerings (cf. Ezek 45:13-46:15; Deut 16:1-17) illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of burnt offerings which should be offered on the altar of Yahweh (Deut 27:6). Likewise, the motif of peace offerings (שׁלמים: Num 29:39) alludes to Deut 27:7.

The motif of vows, which is first introduced in Num 29:39 as referring to cultic offerings and thereafter elaborated in Num 30:2-17 as referring to family matters, together with the motif of freewill offerings and burnt offerings (cf. Deut 12:6.11.17.26) and together with the motif of fulfilling vows (cf. Deut 23:22-24)[94] illustrates the idea of offerings made in the sanctuary (Deut 26:1-15; 27:5-7). The correlated accounts of purifying unclean objects (Num 31:1-24) and of making contributions to the sanctuary (Num 31:25-54; cf. Ezek 45:13-16; Deut 12:6.11.17 etc.) further illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of making pure offerings in the sanctuary (Deut 26:1-15; 27:5-7). The somewhat redundantly introduced in Num 31:14-18 motif of a plague (Num 31:16; cf. 25:8-9.18-19) alludes to the Deuteronomic curses for disloyalty to Yahweh (esp. Deut 28:20-26.58-63).

3.29 Transjordan as an inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (Num 32; cf. Deut 29:1-14)

The combination of the motif of giving Transjordan as an inheritance to Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh and of the motif of the heads of the tribes of Israel (Num 32) originates from Deut 29:1-14.

In particular, the account of giving the kingdom of Sihon king of the Amorites and the kingdom of Og king of Bashan to the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and of their role in conquering Canaan, an account which was borrowed from Deut 3:8-20 (cf. also 1:19-2:15),[95] in Num 32 (esp. 32:18-19.32; diff. Deut 3:20) illustrates the thought that these tribes were given the land of Sihon king of Heshbon and of Og king of Bashan as their inheritance (נחלה: Deut 29:7).

The idea of the heads (ראשׁ) of the tribes of Israel (ישׂראל) as being instructed by Moses (Num 32:28) was borrowed from Deut 29:9.

---

94 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, 322-323.

95 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Life*, 442-450; L. Schmidt, 'Ansiedlung', 500, 504.

3.30 Exodus from Egypt through various places, and possessing the land of Canaan (Num 33; cf. Deut 29:15-32:52)

The somewhat surprisingly introduced combination of the motifs of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt through various places and of the Israelites' possession of the land of Canaan (Num 33) originates from Deut 29:15-32:52.

In particular, the motif of the Israelites going out (יצא) of the land of Egypt (מארץ מצרים: Num 33:1.38) was borrowed from Deut 29:15.24. The narratively superfluous reference to the Egyptians' activity and to their gods (אלהים) during the Israelites' exodus from Egypt (Num 33:3-4; cf. Exod 12:12; diff. Exod 12:37) alludes to Deut 29:15-17. Similarly, the long list of the places through which the Israelites passed on their way after their exodus from Egypt (Num 33:5-49), a list which was partly borrowed from Deut 9:22; 1:1; 10:6-7;[96] 2:8; 32:49-51, illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites went through the midst of various nations (Deut 29:15). The somewhat strangely used motif of the mountains (הר) of the Abarim (העברים) as located near the plains of Moab (מואב), by (על) the Jordan, at Jericho (ירחו: Num 33:47-48), originates from Deut 32:49 (cf. 34:1.8).

The motif of dispossessing (ירשׁ) the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, in order to possess (ירשׁ) this land (Num 33:50-56; diff. Deut 7:1.5), was borrowed from Deut 30:5.16.18; 31:3.13; 32:47. Likewise, the Deuteronomic motif of destroying (שׁמד) the objects of the Canaanite nations (Num 33:52) was borrowed from Deut 31:3-4. The motif of taking and dividing the land of Canaan as an inheritance (נחל) according to the number of the sons of Israel (Num 33:54; cf. 33:51) was borrowed from Deut 31:7; 32:8-9.

The motif of a covenantal threat if the Israelites do not (לא + ים) dispossess the idolaters (Num 33:55-56; cf. 33:52) was borrowed from Deut 30:17-18 (cf. also 31:17-29; 32:16-33).

---

96 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, 353, 355, 357.

3.31 Ideal Israel with its borders and its twelve tribes (Num 34-36; cf. Deut 33-34)

The concluding section concerning ideal Israel with its borders and its twelve tribes (Num 34-36) is a hypertextual reworking of the likewise concluding section Deut 33-34.

In particular, the motif of ideal borders of Israel (Num 34:1-12) was borrowed from Deut 34:1-3 and conflated with Ezek 47:15-20.

The subsequent motif of dividing the land of Canaan among the twelve tribes of Israel (Num 34:13-29) was borrowed from the subsequent fragment Ezek 48:1-29 in order to allude to Deut 33:5-25.[97] The related motifs of the princes of the tribes of Israel and of the heads (ראשׁ) of the families of Israel (ישׂראל), as involved in the division of the land (Num 34:18-28; 36:1), were likewise borrowed from Deut 33:5. The subsequent motifs of the Levitical cities and of the cities of refuge (Num 35) were borrowed from Josh 20-21[98] (which quite naturally follows the story about the division of the land: Josh 13-19) in order to adapt the prophetic idea of Ezek 48:8-22 (one large holy portion in central Canaan) to the more realistic instructions of Josh 20-21 (numerous Levitical cities and cities of refuge).[99] The surprising instructions concerning preserving the inheritance of each tribe (Num 36:1-12; cf. 27:1-11)[100] likewise develop the theme of the division of the land (Num 34:13-29; cf. Ezek 48:1-29; Deut 33:5-25).

The concluding motif of the sons of Israel (בני ישׂראל) doing what Yahweh commanded (אשׁר צוה יהוה) by the hand (יד) of Moses (משׁה) in the plains of Moab (בערבת מואב) across from (על) Jericho (ירחו: Num 36:13; diff. Lev 27:34) was borrowed from Deut 34:1.8-9 and reworked in such a way that it could introduce Deut 1:1 (אלה + the words + אשׁר + spoke + משׁה + אל + ישׂראל + ירדן + ערבה).

---

97 The order of the tribes in Num 34:19-28 slightly differs from that of Deut 33:6-25 because it alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh were given Transjordan as their inheritance (Deut 3:12-17; 29:17), and to the Israelite stories about the origin of the unorthodox tribe of Dan (which had its own sanctuary of Yahweh) from the region of Judaea (Josh 19:40-48; Judg 13-18).

98 Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers*, 374, 376-377, 382.

99 This fact implies that the book of Numbers, like Genesis and Exodus, was written later than the book of Joshua.

100 Cf. R. P. Knierim and G. W. Coats, *Numbers*, 329.

3.32 Conclusions

The books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers together constitute a sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy. They fill the narrative gap between the stories of Genesis and Deuteronomy in such a way that the ideas of Deuteronomy are yet another time systematically clarified and reworked in them.

The Israelite origin of Exodus-Numbers is not as evident as that of Genesis. However, several texts of Exodus-Numbers suggest that their author was an Israelite, who presented the tribe of Ephraim as admitted to the closest proximity to the one legitimate sanctuary of Yahweh (Num 2:17-18.24; 10:21-22), and the tribe of Judah as spiritually inferior to the tribe of Ephraim (Num 13:30; cf. 14:6-9) and summoned, together with the tribe of Dan, to abandon its local place of worship and to contribute to the one legitimate sanctuary of Yahweh (Exod 35:30-35; cf. Num 34:22).

The author of Exodus-Numbers, like the author of Genesis, reformulated the ideas of Deuteronomy in a very creative way. He tried to clarify some of the more difficult ideas of Deuteronomy, for example by conflating several Deuteronomic references to Moses' priestly activity (Deut 9:12-17.18-19.20.21.22.23.24-29) into one simple story (Exod 32). Moreover, he illustrated some of the difficult, especially legal ideas of Deuteronomy with the use of more widely understandable narratives (e.g. Deut 6:7-17 in Exod 4:24-26; Deut 13:10-11 in Lev 10:1-5). At times, these narratives and instructions are quite elaborate in comparison to their Deuteronomic hypotexts (e.g. Exod 7:1-12:33 diff. Deut 6:22; Exod 19:3-31:18 diff. Deut 9:9-11; Exod 35-40 diff. Deut 11:29-12:12), mostly because of the use of much additional material which was taken from other parts of Deuteronomy, from Ezek 40-48,[101] from the book of Joshua,[102] and from other legal, cultic, and narrative texts.

The author of Exodus-Numbers consciously reworked some of the older, very idealistic legal regulations of Deuteronomy into more realistic ones. For example, he reformulated the Deuteronomic idea of remission of debts in every seventh year (Deut 15:1-18) into that of remission of debts in every fiftieth year

---

101 Cf. esp. Exod 24:13-31:17 and Ezek 40-46; Exod 35-40 and Ezek 40-46; Lev 4:1-5:26 and Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; Num 15:1-21 and Ezek 45:21-46:15; 44:30; Num 28:3-29:39 and Ezek 45:13-46:15; Num 31:25-54 and Ezek 45:13-16; Num 34:1-12 and Ezek 47:15-20; Num 34:13-29 and Ezek 48:1-29.

102 Cf. esp. Exod 3:5 and Josh 5:15; Exod 14:21-22.29 and Josh 3:16-17; Num 35 and Josh 20-21.

(Lev 25:8-17.23-55). Likewise, he reworked the crude obligation to take the wife of the deceased brother, in case he had no son (Deut 25:5-10), into the idea of the daughters as being legitimate heirs of their deceased father, in case he had no son (Num 27:1-8).

In the context of the political situation of the Israelites *c*.400 BC, the author of Exodus-Numbers, like the author of Genesis, almost completely deconstructed the Deuteronomic idea of holy war, by reformulating it into those of a miraculous but in itself natural disaster (Exod 14:28 diff. Deut 7:20), of Yahweh's and not the Israelites' task of blotting out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven (Exod 17:14-16 diff. Deut 25:19), and of directing religiously motivated violence not against the Canaanites but against sinful Israelites (Exod 32:26-29 diff. Deut 10:8-9). Moreover, the author of Exodus-Numbers substituted the Deuteronomic idea of one future authoritative successor to Moses (Deut 18:15.18-19) with the thoughts that elders of Israel may at times fulfil the task of being Moses' authoritative successors (Num 11:16-17.25-27.30) and that the whole people of Israel, guided by the Spirit of Yahweh, should be a faithful follower of Moses (Num 11:29).

Accordingly, the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers constitute a consistent, Israelite, literary project of reworking the contents of Deuteronomy in a sequential, hypertextual way, which in some respects resembles that of the likewise Israelite book of Genesis.

Chapter 4: Samuel-Kings as a Judaean sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy

The above-presented analyses have revealed that the books of Deuteronomy, Genesis, and Exodus-Numbers are Israelite hypertextual reworkings of earlier religious texts. Consequently, it might seem that the use of the procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier religious texts was peculiar to ancient Israelite literary activity. However, a detailed intertextual analysis of the books of Samuel and Kings on the one hand and Deuteronomy on the other reveals that the books of Samuel and Kings taken together constitute another, this time distinctively Judaean, example of sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy.

4.1 Initial cultic setting and promise (1 Sam 1:1-2:11; cf. Deut 1:1-25)

The initial section, which deals with worship and promise (1 Sam 1:1-2:1), is a hypertextual reworking of the thematically similar, initial section Deut 1:1-25.

In particular, the initial cultic setting of Israel's ancient, pre-exilic sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Sam 1:3-2:11; cf. Jer 7:12; Josh 18-19; Judg 18:31) alludes to Mount Horeb, the mountain of Yahweh's initial revelation to Israel (Deut 1:2.6.19). The somewhat surprising combination of the motifs of Hannah's initial barrenness and of her son being treated as the firstborn one (1 Sam 1:2.5.11.22.28; cf. Exod 13:2; 22:28; diff. Deut 21:15-17) alludes to the idea of Israel as being Yahweh's (and not simply human) firstborn son (Deut 1:31; cf. Jer 31:9; Exod 4:22; Num 11:12). The idea of Hannah's direct prayer to Yahweh at Shiloh (1 Sam 1:10-16; cf. 2:1-10) alludes to the idea of Israel's direct contact with Yahweh at Mount Horeb (Deut 1:2.6.19; cf. 4:11-13; 5:4.24-26).

The ideas of Yahweh's initial promise and of the Israelites as faithfully going home from Yahweh's sanctuary to their mountain (1 Sam 1:17-19; cf. 1:1: הר) alludes to similar ideas in Deut 1:6-8.19-21.24. The related idea of begetting a son who, similarly to the Moses-like character of Heli, became one of Israel's judges (שׁפט: 1 Sam 1:20; cf. 4:18; 7:6.15-17) alludes to the idea of Moses as appointing judges like him in Israel (Deut 1:9-18).

The motif of strong faith in Yahweh who helps the weak ones to overcome their enemies, to become powerful, and to inherit (נחל) their royal place (1 Sam 2:1-10; cf. Deut 32:1-43) alludes to Deut 1:10-11.21.29-31.38 (cf. 1:42).

The concluding motif of Samuel ministering Yahweh in the presence (פנה) of Eli the priest (1 Sam 2:11.18; 3:1) alludes to the character of Joshua, who stood in the presence of the priestly character of Moses and ministered him (Deut 1:38; cf. Josh 1:1; Exod 24:13; 33:11; Num 11:28; cf. also Deut 17:12; 18:5.7; 21:5 etc.).

4.2 Israel's original sin and Yahweh's curse on evil Israelites (1 Sam 2:12-36; cf. Deut 1:26-35)

The combination of the motifs of Israel's original sin and of Yahweh's curse on evil Israelites (1 Sam 2:12-36) originates from Deut 1:26-35.

In particular, the motif of sinful Israelites being evil (רע: 1 Sam 2:23) was borrowed from Deut 1:35. Likewise, the motif of Yahweh swearing (שׁבע) against the sinful Israelites (1 Sam 2:30-34.36; 3:14) was borrowed from Deut 1:34. Similarly, the motif of not being faithful to Yahweh (אמן) was borrowed from Deut 1:32 and reworked in 1 Sam 2:35; 3:20 into that of being faithful.

The author of 1 Samuel illustrated the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as being evil and unfaithful to Yahweh (Deut 1:26-28.32) with the use of the easily understandable story about the greedy and sinful priests Hophni and Phinehas (1 Sam 2:12-17.22-25.29) who caused the 'original sin' of the whole people of Israel (1 Sam 2:17.24).[1] Likewise, the author of 1 Samuel illustrated the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh's curse on the old, sinful generation of the Israelites, who should not see the Promised Land (Deut 1:34-35.37.40), with the use of the easily understandable account of a prophetic curse which affected the sinful priests and, somewhat surprisingly, old men in Eli's house, and also Eli's eyes (1 Sam 2:27-34.36; cf. 3:1-2).[2]

---

1 It should be noted that the name Phinehas was evidently typical of the priests of the Israelite temple of Yahweh on Mount Gerizim: cf. Y. Magen, H. Misgav, and L. Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (JSP 2; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2004), 67-68 [Inscriptions nos. 24-25], 255 [Inscription no. 384], 259 [Inscription no. 389].

2 Cf. W. Dietrich, *Samuel*, vol. 1, *1 Sam 1-12* (BKAT 8/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010), 144-145.

In his reworking of these Deuteronomic ideas, the Judaean author of 1 Samuel directed the divine curse not against all sinful Israelites but against the priests of Israel's (i.e. Ephraim's) sanctuary at Shiloh (cf. Jer 7:12). In this way, he prepared the background for the long political-religious story about the transfer of the ark of the covenant from the Israelite, divinely cursed sanctuary at Shiloh to the Judaean, divinely blessed sanctuary in Jerusalem (1 Sam 4 – 1 Kgs 9).[3]

4.3 Hope in the new, innocent generation (1 Sam 3; cf. Deut 1:36-39)

The section concerning the young, innocent Samuel, who against the background of the sinful Israelites was regarded as a sign of hope (1 Sam 3), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic fragment Deut 1:36-39.

In particular, the thought that the Joshua-like character of Samuel ministered before (לפני) the Moses-like character of Eli (1 Sam 3:1) originates from Deut 1:38. Likewise, the thought that Samuel remained in the sanctuary while Eli was outside it (1 Sam 3:3) alludes to the similar post-Deuteronomic idea concerning Joshua and Moses (Exod 33:11; cf. Deut 31:14). The idea of Samuel as waking up and running to Eli (1 Sam 3:5-6.8) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that Joshua stood before Moses (Deut 1:38).

The subsequent idea of Samuel as being treated by Eli as his son (בן: 1 Sam 3:6.16) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic text Deut 1:39. Likewise, the thought that the innocent, childish Samuel initially did not know (ידע) Yahweh (1 Sam 3:7; cf. 3:10; diff. 3:9) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the innocent children of the sinful Israelites initially did not know good and evil (Deut 1:39).

The somewhat redundantly repeated motif of Yahweh's curse on Eli because of his sons (1 Sam 3:11-14)[4] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh's

---

3 Cf. T. D. Alexander, 'Regal Dimensions of the תולדות־יעקב: Recovering the Literary Context of Genesis 37-50', in J. G. McConville and K. Möller (eds.), *Reading the Law*, Festschrift G. J. Wenham (LHBOTS 461; T&T Clark: New York · London 2007), 196-212 (esp. 209); J. Lemański, 'Opowiadanie o Arce przymierza (1 Sm 4,1-7,1; 2 Sm 6) jako klucz do teologii Ksiąg Samuela', *ScrSac* 11 (2007) 5-31 (esp. 18-20).

4 Cf. K. Bodner, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary* (HBM 19; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2008), 40; W. Dietrich, *Samuel*, vol. 1, 182-183.

anger against Moses because of the Israelites (Deut 1:37). The Judaean author of 1 Samuel reworked this idea in a way which condemned the northern, Israelite priesthood. Moreover, with the use of this motif, he presented Samuel as already knowing the difference between good (טוב) and evil in Yahweh's eyes (1 Sam 3:18).

The somewhat surprisingly introduced statement that all Israel from Dan to Beer-sheba knew that Samuel was a trustworthy prophet (1 Sam 3:20)[5] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Joshua should cause Israel to inherit the land of Canaan (Deut 1:38; diff. 1:32).

The concluding thought that young Samuel, in difference to Eli, saw (ראה) the signs of Yahweh's presence (1 Sam 3:21; cf. 3:15; diff. 3:2), a thought which is quite surprising in the context of presenting Yahweh as repeatedly speaking and not showing himself to Samuel (1 Sam 3:4.6-14.17-19.21), originates from Deut 1:36 (diff. 1:35). The author of 1 Samuel evidently reworked the older theology of visions received by Yahweh's prophets into that of Yahweh's word revealed to Israel and obeyed by faithful Israelites.

4.4 Israel's unholy war and forty years of the old generation (1 Sam 4-5; cf. Deut 1:40-2:1)

The combination of the motifs of Israel's unholy war and of forty years of the old generation (1 Sam 4-5) originates from Deut 1:40-2:1.

In particular, the motif of going out against enemies (יצא + לקראת) on Judaea's south-western border (1 Sam 4:1; cf. 4:2) was borrowed from Deut 1:44. The motif of Israel's enemies fighting (לחם) against the Israelites (1 Sam 4:1-2.9-10) was borrowed from Deut 1:41 (cf. 1:42).

The thought that Israel was heavily defeated before their enemies (נגף לפני + איב: 1 Sam 4:2-3; cf. 4:10) was borrowed from Deut 1:42. The related idea of Yahweh's only apparent presence in the midst (בקרב) of the sinful Israelites (1 Sam 4:3; cf. 4:4) was likewise borrowed from Deut 1:42.

The account of the Israelites bewailing the defeat in the place of their sanctuary (1 Sam 4:12-22) illustrates the similar Deuteronomic idea of Deut 1:45.

---

5 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC 10; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1983), 34.

While the perfect number of the years of Eli's life (98 = 14 × 7)[6] and Eli's physical disabilities (1 Sam 4:15.18) simply suggest that he already completed his course of life (cf. Deut 31:2; 34:7), the number of forty years of his judging Israel (1 Sam 4:18) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Israel for forty years remained under Moses' authority in the wilderness (Deut 1:3; 2:7; 8:2.4; 29:4; cf. 2:14). The Judaean author of 1 Samuel negatively reworked the remark concerning Moses as retaining his sight and vigor up to his death (Deut 34:7; diff. 31:2), in order to present Israel's (i.e. northern) priests as lacking not only the glorious object of worship, that is the ark of the covenant, but also the tokens of Yahweh's favour towards them (1 Sam 4:15.18.21-22).

The somewhat strange thought that the ark of the God of Israel was for long carried around (סבב) in the exile outside Israel (1 Sam 5:8-10; cf. 5:1-7) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites for long went around Mount Seir (Deut 2:1.3).

4.5 Return towards the land of Canaan (1 Sam 6; cf. Deut 2:2-3)

The section concerning the return of the ark of the covenant to the land of Canaan (1 Sam 6) is a result of a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic account concerning the Israelites' return towards the Promised Land (Deut 2:2-3).

In fact, the idea of a divinely caused return of the ark of the God of Israel from the Gentile region of the Philistines, who lived by the sea, towards the land of Canaan (1 Sam 5:11; 6:2-7:1) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as changing the direction of the Israelites' march from that towards Egypt to that towards Canaan (Deut 2:2-3). Consequently, the theological idea of a partial restoration of Yahweh's grace (1 Sam 6:12-7:1) illustrates the similar idea of Deut 2:3.

In his reworking of the Deuteronomic text Deut 2:2-3 the Judaean author of 1 Samuel stated that although the Philistines wanted to return the ark 'to its place', so presumably to its original place in central Canaan (1 Sam 5:11; 6:2;

---

6 For the use of the symbolic numbers of seven, twelve, ten, and their multiples in ancient Near Eastern texts, see R. Zadok, 'Neo-Assyrian Notes', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Near East*, Festschrift I. Eph'al (Hebrew University Magness: Jerusalem 2008), 312-330 (esp. 313-319).

cf. 6:9), Yahweh in a miraculous way caused the ark's return not to Israel (i.e. to Ephraim) but to Judaea: first to Beth-shemesh (1 Sam 6:9.12-20; cf. Josh 15:10; 21:9.16) and then farther eastwards towards Jerusalem, namely to Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam 6:21-7:2; cf. Josh 15:9.60; Judg 18:12). In this way, the author of the books of Samuel achieved the political-religious aim of writing the story of the ark, namely that of justifying the Judaeans' claims to possess the proper place of the worship of Yahweh: in Jerusalem and not at Shiloh, Bethel, or Shechem.

4.6 Peace with Israel's neighbours (1 Sam 7; cf. Deut 2:4-7)

The account of improved relationships between Yahweh and Israel, as well as Israel finally enjoying peace with its neighbours (1 Sam 7), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic account Deut 2:4-7.

In particular, the idea of Yahweh's grace and protection for the Israelites during a full number of years (שׁנה: 1 Sam 7:2-5; cf. 7:15-17) was borrowed from Deut 2:7. The surprising ideas that the Israelites at Mizpah drew water (מים) but evidently did not drink it because they poured it out before Yahweh, and that they evidently did not eat because they fasted (1 Sam 7:6)[7] allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites in Edom had to purchase food and buy (or dig for: כרה) water (Deut 2:6). The idea of Yahweh's protection and help for the Israelites in a hostile environment (1 Sam 7:7-12) was borrowed from Deut 2:7. The ideas of respecting the integrality of national borders (גבול: 1 Sam 7:13-14) and of the Israelites as living in peace with their neighbours (1 Sam 7:14) were borrowed from Deut 2:4 (cf. 2:5).

---

7 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel* (NAC 7; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 1996), 106-107; S. Bar-Efrat, *Das Erste Buch Samuel: Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar*, trans. J. Klein (BWANT 176; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2007), 134; D. T. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2007), 234.

4.7 Men of war rejected by Yahweh (1 Sam 8-15; cf. Deut 2:8-16)

The story about the rise and rejection of the militant king Saul (1 Sam 8-15) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic account which refers to the origin and rejection of the men of war (Deut 2:8-16).

In particular, the motif of the king, especially Saul, as a man of war (מלחמה: esp. 1 Sam 8:11-12.20; 13:22; 14:20-23.47.52; 15:18) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the old, sinful generation of the Israelites as men of war (Deut 2:14.16; cf. 2:9). In particular, the thought that Saul fought against the Ammonites, and against Moab and Edom (1 Sam 11:1-13; 12:12; 14:47; cf. 12:9), in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Israel should maintain peaceful relationships with these three peoples (Deut 2:4-23).

The thought that Saul was very powerful and tall (1 Sam 9:1-2; 10:23) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of legendary giants who once lived in the lands of Moab and Edom (Deut 2:10-12). The enigmatic account of Saul initially passing through (עבר) various lands (ארץ: 1 Sam 9:4-5) and going (הלך) farther and farther (1 Sam 9:3-10; 10:2-14)[8] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites likewise initially passed through various lands while going to the brook of Zered (Deut 2:8-9.14).

The thought that the hand of Yahweh could be against the Israelites (היתה + יד־יהוה + ב: 1 Sam 12:15) was borrowed from Deut 2:15. The related, subsequent idea that the people (עם) of Israel could die (מות) in the aftermath of Yahweh's anger against them (1 Sam 12:16-19) was borrowed from Deut 2:16. The same Deuteronomic idea was reworked in a negative way in 1 Sam 14:39-45.

The thought that Saul, representing the old generation of the men of war, was rejected by Yahweh after a certain number of years (שנה: 1 Sam 13:1-14) and after a certain number of days which passed until his death (עד + יום: 1 Sam 14:52-15:35) was borrowed from Deut 2:14 and conflated in 1 Sam 14:48-15:33 with the idea of the obligation to utterly destroy Amalek (Deut 25:17-19).[9] On

---

8 Cf. M. J. Evans, *1 and 2 Samuel* (NIBCOT 6; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2000), 44.

9 Cf. H. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1899), 131; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2002), 619-620; D. Dziadosz, *Gli oracoli divini in 1 Sam 8 – 2 Re 25: Redazione e teologia nella storia deuteronomistica dei re* (Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej: Przemyśl 2002), 102.

the other hand, the thought that the young Israelites Jonathan and his armour-bearing lad successfully, with Yahweh's help, went over (עבר) to the enemy territory (1 Sam 14:1-23) alludes to the similar Deuteronomic thought that the new generation of the Israelites successfully, with Yahweh's help, went over to the enemy territory (Deut 2:13-14).

4.8 New, innocent generation (1 Sam 16; cf. Deut 2:17-23)

The story about the calling and about the innocent character of young David (1 Sam 16) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic account which refers to the rise of the new, innocent generation of the Israelites (Deut 2:17-23).

In particular, the motif of Yahweh telling someone (דבר יהוה) to go to a certain place (1 Sam 16:4) was borrowed from Deut 2:17. The thought that seven sons of Jesse were numerous and tall (1 Sam 16:6-10), which resembles the idea of Saul's great height (1 Sam 9:2; 10:23), alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of legendary giants who once lived in the land of Ammon (Deut 2:20-21; cf. 2:10-12.22-23). On the other hand, the thought that David, who lived his youth in the wilderness (1 Sam 17:28; cf. 17:34-37), was young and innocent (1 Sam 16:11-12; cf. 16:18.21-23)[10] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the new generation of the Israelites, which was born and brought up in the wilderness, was young and not rebellious (Deut 2:16-18; cf. 1:39).

4.9 Fighting against an iron-equipped giant (1 Sam 17; cf. Deut 2:24-3:17)

The story about David's fight against the powerful, metal-equipped giant Goliath (1 Sam 17) is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic account which describes the new generation of the Israelites as fighting against powerful kings in Transjordan, especially against the iron-equipped giant Og (Deut 2:24-3:17).

In particular, the motif of a war (מלחמה) of the Israelites' Gentile neighbours against (לקראת) the Israelites (1 Sam 17:1-48.55) was borrowed from Deut

---

10 Cf. J. R. Short, *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David* (HTS 63; Harvard University: Cambridge, Mass. 2010), 146-155.

2:24.32; 3:1 (cf. 3:22). The related motif of a single Gentile warrior and of a whole Gentile army as coming out (יצא) against the Israelites (1 Sam 17:4; cf. 17:8.20.55) was borrowed from Deut 2:32; 3:1. The motif of Goliath's great height, which was measured in cubits (אמה: 1 Sam 17:4), was borrowed from the Deuteronomic description of Og's great bed, which was measured in cubits (Deut 3:11). The motif of the giant's metal armour, which was partly made of iron (ברזל: 1 Sam 17:5-7),[11] likewise alludes to the idea of metal, more precisely iron, equipment of the giant Og (Deut 3:11). In his reworking of Deut 3:11 the author of 1 Samuel tried to adapt the description of a Hellenistic phalangite, who wielded a heavy sarissa[12] as his main weapon (1 Sam 17:7; diff. Is 2:4; Nah 3:3; Hab 3:11),[13] to the realities of the end of the Bronze Age (1 Sam 17:5-6).

The motif of the Israelites being afraid (ירא) of the powerful Gentile warrior (1 Sam 17:11.24) is a negative reworking of the Deuteronomic summons not to be afraid of such a warrior (Deut 3:2; cf. 3:22). The thought that the young Israelite David, who was not a man of war, struck down (נכה) the powerful Gentile warrior (1 Sam 17:25-50.57; cf. 17:9)[14] originates from Deut 2:33; 3:3. The motif of Yahweh giving (נתן) the Gentile warrior into the hand (ביד) of the Israelites (1 Sam 17:46-47) was borrowed from Deut 2:24.30; 3:2-3. The idea of the Israelites as plundering the place of their Gentile enemies (1 Sam 17:53) was borrowed from Deut 2:35; 3:7.

---

11 Cf. M. Garsiel, 'The Valley of Elah Battle and the Duel of David with Goliath: Between History and Artistic Theological Historiography', in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (VTSup 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 391-426 (esp. 399-404); J. Lemański, 'Dawid i Goliat, czyli spór o to, jaki obraz Dawida prezentuje 1 Sm 17, 1-18, 5?', *RoczB* 2 (2010) 77-121 (esp. 88-91).

12 In difference to a hoplite, Goliath needed a shield-bearer because he wielded a heavy sarissa with his two hands (and not a spear or a sword with the right hand and a shield with the left hand). Shield-bearers did not protect Greek seventh- to fifth-century BC hoplites but third- and second-century BC Hellenistic warriors who, in the context of the land of Israel, originated from Asia Minor and Crete, and who were stationed e.g. in Sidon: cf. I. Finkelstein, 'Philistines in the Bible: A Late-Monarchic Perspective', *JSOT* 27.2 (2002) 131-167 (esp. 145-146). This fact suggests that the books of Samuel and Kings were written *c*.300 BC.

13 The motif of a sword (חרב) was added in 1 Sam 17:45.51 (cf. 17:47.50) in order to allude to Hos 1:7 (לא + בחרב + ישע).

14 Cf. J. Lemański, 'Dawid', 107.

4.10 Covenant within Israel (1 Sam 18:1-5; cf. Deut 3:18-22)

The account of Jonathan's covenant with David, which constituted a covenant within Israel (1 Sam 18:1-5), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic fragment which presents an agreement among the Israelites who lived in Transjordan and the rest of the Israelite tribes (Deut 3:18-22).

In particular, the characters of Jonathan and David, two young Israelite warriors (1 Sam 18:1.3-4), allude to the Deuteronomic idea of the new, innocent generation of the Israelites, who with Yahweh's help conquered Transjordan (cf. Deut 3:18-19; cf. 2:16-3:17). The idea of not returning (שׁוב) to the family but joining the army (1 Sam 18:2.4-5) was borrowed from Deut 3:18-20. The particular idea of being a well-equipped warrior (1 Sam 18:4) was likewise borrowed from Deut 3:18.

The idea of successful fighting against Israel's enemies (1 Sam 18:5) was borrowed from Deut 3:22. The related idea of becoming a commander of the Israelite army (1 Sam 18:5) was borrowed from Deut 3:18.21.

4.11 Yahweh's disfavour towards the old leader of Israel and favour towards the young one (1 Sam 18:6-30; cf. Deut 3:23-29)

The story about Yahweh's disfavour towards old Saul and favour towards young David (1 Sam 18:6-30) originates from a hypertextual reworking, in an almost consistently sequential way, of the Deuteronomic fragment Deut 3:23-29, which refers to Yahweh's disfavour towards old Moses and favour towards young Joshua.

In particular, the motif of Yahweh's greatness which was revealed in the Israelites' defeat of their enemies (1 Sam 18:6-7) was borrowed from Deut 3:24. The subsequent idea of angry eyes (עין) of the old leader of Israel (1 Sam 18:8-9; cf. 18:10-12) originates from Deut 3:26-27. The subsequent image of the young leader as being before the people (לפני העם: 1 Sam 18:13; cf. 18:14-16) was borrowed from Deut 3:28. The motif of the old leader as seeing (ראה) from afar the success of the young generation (1 Sam 18:15.28) originates from Deut 3:27-28. The subsequent idea of becoming a future heir over Israel (1 Sam 18:17-30)

originates from the Deuteronomic idea of giving the land of Canaan to the Israelites as an inheritance (Deut 3:28).

4.12 Wisdom and righteousness, and an authoritative ordinance (1 Sam 19:1-7; cf. Deut 4:1-14)

The story about Jonathan's wisdom and righteousness, and about Saul's authoritative ordinance (1 Sam 19:1-7), is a hypertextual reworking of the Deuteronomic fragment which refers to the law as Israel's wisdom and righteousness, and as Yahweh's authoritative ordinances (Deut 4:1-14).

In particular, the narratively superfluous remark that the righteous Jonathan was Saul's son (בן: 1 Sam 19:1; cf. 13:6)[15] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites' righteous sons (Deut 4:9-10). The idea of relating (נגד) the king's words (הדברים: 1 Sam 19:2-3.7; cf. 19:1) originates from Deut 4:13. The somewhat surprisingly introduced thought that David should take care (השמר: 1 Sam 19:2)[16] originates from the thematically related Deuteronomic motif in Deut 4:9 (cf. 4:15; cf. also 4:2.6). The thought that David did not see Saul at that time (1 Sam 19:2-3) originates from the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites did not see Yahweh at Mount Horeb (Deut 4:12; cf. 4:15). The idea of standing (עמד) beside the furious king (1 Sam 19:3) was borrowed from Deut 4:10-11.

The motif of wisdom and righteousness, set against stupidity and wickedness (1 Sam 19:4-5), was borrowed from Deut 4:6.8. The somewhat surprisingly used idea of Saul as listening to the voice of his son (שמע + קול: 1 Sam 19:6) originates from the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as listening to the voice of Yahweh (Deut 4:12; cf. 4:1.10). The motif of the king's authoritative ordinance (1 Sam 19:6) was borrowed from Deut 4:13.

---

15 Cf. K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 203.

16 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *La loi du plus fort: Histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel 8 à 1 Rois 2* (BETL 154; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven [et al.] 2000), 109-110.

4.13 Saving life and avoiding deceitful images in the human form (1 Sam 19:8-17; cf. Deut 4:15-40)

The combination of the motifs of saving the life of an Israelite and of using deceitful images in the human form (1 Sam 19:8-17) originates from Deut 4:15-40.

In particular, the somewhat surprisingly introduced motif of war (מלחמה) and of a wonderful victory (1 Sam 19:8)[17] was borrowed from Deut 4:34. The likewise surprising combination of the ideas of watching (שמר) David and of saving his life (נפש: 1 Sam 19:11)[18] originates from the Deuteronomic motif of watching the Israelites' lives (Deut 4:15; cf. 4:23), which was conflated in 1 Sam 19:12 with that of saving the Israelites' lives by letting them down through a window (Josh 2:15-22).[19] The mockingly used motif of images in the human form (1 Sam 19:13.16), which deceived the Israelites (1 Sam 19:14-15.17),[20] alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibition of making religiously deceitful images in the forms of human beings (Deut 4:16; cf. 4:23.25).

4.14 City of refuge, righteousness, and making a covenant (1 Sam 19:18-21:1; cf. Deut 4:41-5:3)

The combination of the motifs of a city of refuge, righteousness, and making a covenant (1 Sam 19:18-21:1) originates from Deut 4:41-5:3.

In particular, the motif of David fleeing from Saul to a certain city (1 Sam 19:18; 20:1; cf. 19:10: נוס) originates from the Deuteronomic motif of cities of refuge (Deut 4:41-43; cf. 19:1-13). The particular name of this city, namely 'the high place' Ramah (הרמה: 1 Sam 19:18; cf. 'the two high places' Ramathaim: 1 Sam 1:1), which is redundantly repeated in the formula 'the grazing places

---

17 Cf. ibid. 113.

18 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 196-197; K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 205; A. Heinrich, *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids und im Alten Testament* (BZAW 401; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 254-255.

19 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 208; K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 206; A. A. Fischer, 'Michal im Fenster der Redaktion (2 Sam 6,14.16.20-23)', in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke: Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (OBO 249; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2011), 194-208 (esp. 197).

20 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 197-198, 200; J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 115-116.

(נוית) in Ramah' (1 Sam 19:19.22-23; 20:1; cf. 19:18),[21] by means of internymic deviation[22] alludes to the name of the 'high places' Ramoth in the pastureland of Gilead (Deut 4:43; cf. Jer 50:19; cf. also Num 32:1; Song 4:1; 6:5; Mi 7:14), a name which was at times also spelled as Ramah (רמה: 2 Kgs 8:29; cf. 8:28). The Judaean author of 1 Samuel evidently wanted to avoid mentioning Shechem, the Deuteronomic-Israelite city of the sanctuary of Yahweh, as the city of refuge in Ephraim (cf. Josh 20:7; 21:21; cf. also 1 Kgs 12:1-25; Ps 60:8; 108:8; Jdt 5:16; Sir 50:26).[23]

The motif of the angry Saul as sending (שלח) representatives to take (לקח) David from his city of refuge, so that Saul could kill (מות) him (1 Sam 19:20; cf. 19:11.14-15; 20:31), originates from the Deuteronomic idea of the elders of the city as sending and taking the guilty person from his city of refuge, so that the avenger of blood could kill him (Deut 19:12). The surprisingly used motif of falling into a prophetic frenzy, which protected the innocent David from being taken away from his city of refuge (1 Sam 19:20-24; cf. 20:1),[24] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the function of cities of refuge (Deut 4:42; cf. 19:3-10).

The subsequent motif of Jonathan's righteousness (1 Sam 20:2.4.9.32) most probably alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of just law (Deut 4:44-5:1). The subsequent, somewhat surprisingly used idea of Jonathan as making (כרת) a covenant (ברית) of Yahweh with (עם) the house of David (1 Sam 20:8.16;

---

21 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 198.

22 For a detailed description of the procedure of internymic deviation, which is characteristic of many intentionally hypertextual writings (cf. e.g. 'Og in Deut 3:1-13 from Gog in Ezek 38:2-39:11), see W. G. Müller, 'Interfigurality: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures', in H. F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (Research in Text Theory: Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 1991), 101-121 (esp. 104-105). Cf. also B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 238 n. 35, 257 n. 87, 263 n. 107; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 99.

23 This Judaean *damnatio memoriae* of Shechem in the books of Samuel and Kings (cf. only 1 Kgs 12:1-25) was a response to the Israelite *damnatio memoriae* of Jerusalem in the Pentateuch.

24 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 118.

cf. 20:12-15.17.41-42)[25] alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as making a covenant with all generations of the Israelites (Deut 5:2-3).

The enigmatic and strangely used idea of sending three arrows and an innocent little boy far away, depending on the energy of the shooter (1 Sam 20:20-22.35-40),[26] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of pursuing an innocent homicide and possibly overtaking him on his way to one of the three cities of refuge, depending on the intensity of the anger of the avenger of blood (Deut 19:6). The additional, somewhat redundant thought that David was not guilty of his absence at Saul's feast yesterday (תמול: 1 Sam 20:27; cf. 20:24-26)[27] may allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the unintentional homicide was not guilty of enmity yesterday and the day before that (Deut 4:42; cf. 19:4.6).

4.15 Remaining in the face of Yahweh and respecting holiness (1 Sam 21:2-10; cf. Deut 5:4-5)

The combination of the motifs of remaining in the face of Yahweh in his sanctuary and of respecting holiness (1 Sam 21:2-10) originates from Deut 5:4-5.

In particular, the surprisingly introduced idea of David as being alone, only with a word (דבר) of the king, in the otherwise unknown sanctuary at Nob (1 Sam 21:2-3.9)[28] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Moses as being alone, only with the word of Yahweh, on Mount Horeb (Deut 5:4-5). The idea of David as being in the sanctuary and having no bread (לחם: 1 Sam 21:4; cf. 21:5.7) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that on Mount Horeb Moses ate no bread (Deut 9:9). The motif of being in the face (פנים) of Yahweh, which is expressed with the use of the ideas of 'the bread of the face' as given to David's people (1 Sam 21:5.7; cf. Exod 25:30 etc.) and of a layman as remaining in the face of Yahweh (1 Sam 21:8), alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of Yahweh speaking with the Israelites face to face (Deut 5:4). The idea of David's people as respecting holiness (1 Sam 21:5-6; cf. 21:7) alludes to the idea of the people of Israel as respecting holiness of Yahweh's presence (Deut 5:5).

---

25 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 207; J. Lozovyy, *Saul, Doeg, Nabal, and the "Son of Jesse": Readings in 1 Samuel 16-25* (LHBOTS 497; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009), 140-141.

26 Cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 191; A. Heinrich, *David*, 300.

27 Cf. A. Heinrich, *David*, 305.

28 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 131 n. 1, 132 n. 6, 133 n. 12.

4.16 House of slavery, no Gentile gods, not hating Yahweh, not uttering Yahweh's name in vain, and not doing work every day (1 Sam 21:11-23:28; cf. Deut 5:6-15)

The sequence of the motifs of escaping from the house of slavery, having no Gentile gods, not hating Yahweh, not uttering Yahweh's name in trivialities, and not doing things every day (1 Sam 21:11-23:28) originates from Deut 5:6-15.

In particular, the surprisingly introduced motifs of the land (ארץ) and of the house (בית) of a foreign, powerful ruler (1 Sam 21:12.15; cf. 21:11.13-14)[29] were borrowed from Deut 5:6. Likewise, the repeatedly used motif of the servants (עבדים) of this ruler (1 Sam 21:12.15) was borrowed from Deut 5:6. Similarly, the idea of David as escaping, together with other people who were oppressed, indebted, and embittered, from (מן) that land to the land of Canaan (1 Sam 22:1; cf. 22:2) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as bringing the Israelites out of the land of slavery (Deut 5:6).

The subsequent, somewhat surprising idea of David as leaving his parents with the face (פנה) of the king of Moab and as returning to Judaea (1 Sam 22:4-5; cf. 22:3) probably alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as having no Gentile gods in the face of Yahweh (Deut 5:7; cf. also 5:6).

The subsequent story about Saul's inexcusable hate for the son (בן) of Jesse, for his possible thousands (אלפים), for the son (בן) of Ahitub, and for the priests of Yahweh (1 Sam 22:6-23; esp. 22:7-9.12-13.17-19.21) alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas of Yahweh as seeing the iniquity of those who hate him and of his showing loyalty to the thousands, presumably of future generations, of those who love him (Deut 5:9-10).

The subsequent story about David as inquiring of Yahweh what he should do in his serious doubts (1 Sam 23:1-13; esp. 23:2.4.10-12) negatively illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not utter the name of Yahweh in trivialities (Deut 5:11).

The subsequent story about David dwelling (ישב) and hiding in various places while others moved (1 Sam 23:14-28; esp. 23:14.18-19.22-25) illustrates the idea of observing the Sabbath (שׁבת: Deut 5:12.14-15). The idea of Saul as seeking David every day (יום: 1 Sam 23:14-28; esp. 23:14) negatively illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites should do no work on the Sabbath day

29 Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 216.

(Deut 5:12-15). The somewhat surprisingly used idea of strengthening David's hand in God (חזק + יד + אלהים: 1 Sam 23:16; cf. 23:14.17.20) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of God delivering the Israelites with his strong hand (Deut 5:15). The redundantly used motif of the covenant between Jonathan and David before Yahweh (1 Sam 23:18; cf. 18:3; 20:8) likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic justification of observing the Sabbath day (Deut 5:15). The additionally used motif of a messenger (מלאך) who did his work (1 Sam 23:27) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of not doing one's work (מלאכה) on the Sabbath day (Deut 5:13-14).

4.17 Honouring the father and not committing murder (1 Sam 24; cf. Deut 5:16-17)

The story about David as not murdering Saul, whom David regarded as his father (1 Sam 24), is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 5:16-17.

In particular, the thought that David should not secretly murder his enemy Saul (1 Sam 24:5-8.11-14.19), which is narratively justified by the ideas that Saul was Yahweh's anointed (1 Sam 24:7.11) and that Yahweh should do justice to David (1 Sam 24:13-14.16), illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of committing murder (Deut 5:17).

David's reverential, surprising reference to Saul as his father (אב: 1 Sam 24:12; cf. 24:9; diff. 26:17-20.22-24)[30] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of honouring one's father (Deut 5:16). The repeatedly used ideas that David repaid Saul good (טובה: 1 Sam 24:18-20) and that Yahweh should reward David with good (טובה: 1 Sam 24:20; cf. 24:21-22) allude to the Deuteronomic idea that Yahweh will cause that it will go well (יטב) with the one who honours his father (Deut 5:16).

30 Cf. ibid. 240.

4.18 Not committing murder, adultery, theft, false witness, or illicit coveting (1 Sam 25; cf. Deut 5:17-21)

The combination of the motifs of not committing murder, adultery, theft, false witness, or illicit coveting (1 Sam 25) originates from Deut 5:17-21.

In particular, the image of David as not coveting Abigail, Nabal's intelligent and beautiful wife (אשה: 1 Sam 25:3.14.37), but marrying her only after Nabal's death (1 Sam 25:38-43; cf. 25:44),[31] illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of coveting one's neighbour's wife (Deut 5:21). The related image of David as not coveting Nabal's house (בית: 1 Sam 25:6.17.35-36; cf. 25:28) illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of coveting one's neighbour's house (Deut 5:21). The related description of David as not coveting and not stealing anything that belonged to (כל אשר ל) Nabal, but accepting the goods which Abigail brought to him as her presents (1 Sam 25:6-8.21-22; cf. 25:18-19.27.35-37.42), illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibitions of coveting one's neighbour's property (Deut 5:21) and of stealing (Deut 5:19). The related image of David as not coveting anything that was in Nabal's fields (שדה: 1 Sam 25:7.15-16.21) illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of coveting one's neighbour's field (Deut 5:21). The related idea of David as not coveting the wealthy Abigail, who surprisingly and repeatedly presented herself as David's maidservant (אמה: 1 Sam 25:23-28.30-31.41),[32] alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibition of coveting one's neighbour's maidservant (Deut 5:21).

The idea of Nabal as in fact falsely answering (ענה) against David, which constituted a breach of faith (שקר) between them (1 Sam 25:10-11.21; cf. 25:6-7.15-16), illustrates the prohibition of answering with an unrestrained, false witness against one's neighbour, which constitutes a breach of faith (Deut 5:20; Exod 20:16).

---

31 Cf. J. Kessler, 'Sexuality and Politics: The Motif of the Displaced Husband in the Books of Samuel', *CBQ* 62 (2000) 409-423 (esp. 414).

32 Cf. K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 266-271; M. Peetz, *Abigail, die Prophetin: Mit Klugheit und Schönheit für Gewaltverzicht: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu 1 Sam 25* (FzB 116; Echter: Würzburg 2008), 143-144; C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, 'Frauen im Gespräch mit David – deuteronomistische Zwischenrufe?', in id. (ed.), *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten* (BWANT 188; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2010), 132-156 (esp. 139-144).

The thought that it was in fact Yahweh and not David who killed Nabal (1 Sam 25:13.17.22.26.31.33-34.37-39) illustrates the Deuteronomic prohibition of committing murder (Deut 5:17).

The surprisingly introduced thought that David took Abigail and Ahinoam as his two lawful wives, notwithstanding the fact that he had previously been married to Michal (1 Sam 25:42-44; cf. 27:3; 30:5.18; 2 Sam 2:2; diff. 2 Sam 3:2-5; 5:13; 1 Chr 3:1-9 [seven and more wives]), alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibition of committing adultery (Deut 5:18) and to the Deuteronomic permission to have two wives, presumably one loved and one unloved (Deut 21:15; cf. Gen 4:19; 32:23; 1 Sam 1:2 etc.).

4.19 Teaching the sons, guarding the hand and the head, serving only one God and not other gods, swearing by Yahweh's name, and keeping watch (1 Sam 26; cf. Deut 5:22-6:25)

The story about David as sparing the life of Saul (1 Sam 26) differs from the earlier, similar story 1 Sam 24 in its use of the combination of the motifs of teaching the sons, guarding the hand and the head, serving only one God and not other gods, swearing by Yahweh's name, and keeping watch, a combination which originates from Deut 5:22-6:25.

In particular, the idea of not guarding Saul's camp (1 Sam 26:3.5-6; diff. 24:4) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic command to have signs of remembering on the doorposts and on the gates (Deut 6:9). The idea of Saul's people (העם) as being around (סביב) him (1 Sam 26:5.7.14; cf. 26:15; diff. 24:4.11) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Gentile peoples as being around Israel (Deut 6:14).

The thought that David instructed the son (בן) of Zeruiah and the son (בן) of Ner (1 Sam 26:6.14; diff. 24:4.9) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should teach Yahweh's words to their sons (Deut 6:7.20-21; cf. 6:2). The subsequent idea of not guarding Saul's spear and head (1 Sam 26:7.11-12.16.22; diff. 24:4-7.12) in a negative way alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic command to bind signs of remembering on the hand and on the head (Deut 6:8).

The thought that David served (עבד) only one God (אלהים) and not other gods (אלהים אחרים: 1 Sam 26:8.19; diff. 24:5.10) in a negative way illustrates the

Deuteronomic ideas that only Yahweh is the God of the Israelites, and that the Israelites should serve only Yahweh and not other gods (Deut 6:4.13-14). The related motif of David swearing by Yahweh's name (1 Sam 26:10.16.19-20; diff. 24:7.10-11.13) illustrates the Deuteronomic command to swear by Yahweh's name alone (Deut 6:13). The subsequent, somewhat surprising thought that Yahweh will somehow strike and kill Saul (1 Sam 26:10; diff. 24:7)[33] alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh may destroy the Israelites (Deut 6:15).

The idea of going over (עבר) to the realm of freedom (1 Sam 26:13.22; diff. 24:9.17-18) alludes to the similar Deuteronomic idea of Deut 6:1. The image of David as standing (עמד) on top of a mountain (הר: 1 Sam 26:13.20; diff. 24:9.15) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of Moses as standing on top of Mount Horeb (Deut 5:22-23.31; cf. 5:5).

The thought that Abner did not keep watch over (שׁמר) the king (1 Sam 26:15-16; diff. 24:10-11) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should keep Yahweh's commandments (Deut 5:29.32; 6:2-3.17.25) and take care (שׁמר) not forget Yahweh (Deut 6:12).

The idea of David's righteousness (צדקה) and faithfulness as repaid by Yahweh (1 Sam 26:23; diff. 24:18) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas of Yahweh as repaying for doing what is right and good (Deut 6:18), and of the Israelites' righteousness (Deut 6:25).

The thought that David went his way (הלך + דרך: 1 Sam 26:25; diff. 24:23) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should walk the ways which Yahweh commanded them (Deut 5:33; cf. 6:7). The thought that Saul returned (שׁוב) to his place (1 Sam 26:25; diff. 24:23) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites, after their meeting with Moses, returned to their tents (Deut 5:30).

---

33 Cf. K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 277; Y. Ziegler, *Promises to Keep: The Oath in Biblical Narrative* (VTSup 120; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2008), 212-213.

4.20 Separating from the Gentiles, utterly destroying Gentile nations in the land of Canaan, and imposing a ban on Gentile worship (1 Sam 27-28; cf. Deut 7:1-16)

The combination of the ideas concerning the Israelites as separating from the Gentiles, utterly destroying Gentile nations in the land of Canaan, and imposing a ban on Gentile worship in the land of Canaan (1 Sam 27-28) originates from Deut 7:1-16.

In particular, the idea of David as going to the land (אל־ארץ) which was inhabited by the Gentiles (1 Sam 27:1-4) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as going to the land of Canaan, a land which was inhabited by the Gentiles (Deut 7:1). The subsequent thought that David separated from the Gentiles by living in a Judaean enclave in their land (1 Sam 27:5-7) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should separate from the Gentile inhabitants of the land of Canaan (Deut 7:2-4).

The narratively strange idea of David as striking (נכה) and utterly destroying the Gentile nations who lived in the outskirts of the land (ארץ) of Canaan (1 Sam 27:8-12)[34] illustrates the Deuteronomic command to strike and utterly destroy the Gentile nations who live in the land of Canaan (Deut 7:1-2.16).[35] The surprisingly used name of the Geshurites (הגשורי: cf. Deut 3:14; Josh 12:5; 13:11.13) and the name of the otherwise unknown Girzites (הגרזי: 1 Sam 27:8) by means of internymic deviation allude to the names of the Girgashites (הגרגשי) and of the Perizzites (הפרזי: Deut 7:1).[36] The name of the Amalekites (1 Sam 27:8) was borrowed from Num 14:25.43.45 etc.

The thought that Saul removed and exterminated various kinds of practitioners of Gentile worship from the land of Canaan (1 Sam 28:3.9; cf. 28:7-8.10.12-13.21) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites should destroy various kinds of Gentile worship in the land of Canaan (Deut 7:5; cf. 7:25; 18:10-12.14).[37] The idea of Saul as being afraid (ירא) of the Gentile army

---

34 Cf. K. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 287-288.

35 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 261-262.

36 Cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 237.

37 Cf. B. T. Arnold, ‘Necromancy and Cleromancy in 1 and 2 Samuel’, *CBQ* 66 (2004) 199-213 (esp. 205, 207); D. Wagner, *Geist und Tora: Studien zur göttlichen Legitima-*

(1 Sam 28:5; cf. 28:15.20) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic exhortation that the Israelites should not be afraid of the armies of their Gentile enemies (Deut 7:18-19.21). The thought that Yahweh abandoned and destroyed the disobedient Saul (1 Sam 28:6.15-20) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh repays the one who hates him (Deut 7:10). The thought that Saul should have utterly destroyed Amalek (1 Sam 28:18; cf. 15:9-29; cf. also Deut 25:19) once more alludes to the thought that the Israelites should utterly destroy the Gentile nations who live in the land of Canaan (Deut 7:1-2.16).

4.21 Yahweh's help in utterly destroying more numerous Gentiles in Canaan (1 Sam 29-30; cf. Deut 7:17-8:18)

The story about Yahweh as helping David in utterly destroying more numerous Gentiles in Canaan (1 Sam 29-30) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 7:17-8:18.

In particular, the description of the numerous Philistine army, which did not need David's help, although he proved to be a powerful warrior (1 Sam 29; esp. 29:2-5), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Gentile enemies of the Israelites are more numerous than the Israelites (Deut 7:17; cf. 7:1). On the other hand, the repeated remark that David defeated ten thousands (1 Sam 29:5; cf. 18:7; cf. also 30:17) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites may defeat more numerous Gentile enemies (Deut 7:17-19; cf. 7:1-2).

The thought that David strengthened (חזק) himself in Yahweh his God during the war against the powerful Canaanites (1 Sam 30:6; cf. 30:1-5) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh, the God of the Israelites, will reveal his strong hand (Deut 7:19) and give them power to defeat their enemies and to gain the wealth of the land of Canaan (Deut 7:21-24; 8:18). In difference to the earlier account 1 Sam 27:8-12, which pointed to David's own power (cf. Deut 7:1-2.16), the account of David's battle against the Amalekites (1 Sam 30:7-31; esp. 30:7-8.23.26) demonstrates the idea of Yahweh's help in the Israelites' defeat of their more numerous enemies and in their gaining the wealth of the land of Canaan (Deut 7:21-24; 8:17-18).

---

tion und Delegitimation von Herrschaft im Alten Testament anhand Erzählungen über König Saul (ABIG 15; Evangelische: Leipzig 2005), 247-248.

The motif of a diminishing number of the warriors who really participated in the battle (1 Sam 30:9-10.21; cf. Judg 7:2-7), especially confronted with the evidently higher number of their enemies (1 Sam 30:17), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that few Israelites may defeat more numerous Gentile enemies (Deut 7:17-19; cf. 7:1-2).

The idea of the Israelites as giving bread (לחם) with cakes of figs and dried grapes to eat (אכל), as well as water (מים) to drink, to a certain Egyptian (מצרי) slave (עבד) in the wilderness (1 Sam 30:11-13) alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas concerning Yahweh as giving the Israelites something instead of bread to eat, as well as water to drink, in the wilderness, on their way from the Egyptian slavery (Deut 8:2-3.14-16), and as giving them bread to eat with figs, grapes, and water in the land of Canaan (Deut 8:7-10.12).

The thought that some Canaanite enemies escaped from the battlefield (1 Sam 30:17) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will chase and destroy those who survived the battle against the Israelites (Deut 7:20).

The idea of David as taking cattle, apart from everything which was originally taken by the Amalekites from Judaea (1 Sam 30:16.19), as spoil which was given by Yahweh to all Judaeans (1 Sam 30:20-31; diff. 15:9-23)[38] alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas that the Israelites should not take the banned Canaanite gold or silver (Deut 7:25), but they may take as spoil the cattle which lives in the land of Canaan (Deut 2:35; 3:7).

4.22 Perishing as a result of not obeying the voice of Yahweh (1 Sam 31 – 2 Sam 1; cf. Deut 8:19-20)

The story about Saul's death, which was regarded as a result of his not obeying the voice of Yahweh (1 Sam 31 – 2 Sam 1; cf. 1 Sam 28:16-19), is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 8:19-20.

In particular, the previously given reason for Saul's death, namely that of his not obeying the voice of Yahweh (לא שמע בקול יהוה: 1 Sam 28:18), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as perishing because of their not obeying the voice of Yahweh (Deut 8:20). This idea is further elaborated in a narrative way by the description of Saul's shameful, suicide death (1 Sam 31:4-6), by the de-

---

38 Cf. A. A. Fischer, 'Beutezug und Segensgabe: Zur Redaktionsgeschichte der Liste in 1 Sam. xxx 26-31', *VT* 53 (2003) 48-64 (esp. 49-52).

scription of his indecent, Gentile-style burial (1 Sam 31:8-13), and by the suggestion that Saul's death was not caused by the enmity of David, who was in fact an upright and compassionate man (2 Sam 1; esp. 1:18).

The concluding lament over Israelite weapons which perished (אבד) in the war (2 Sam 1:27) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as totally perishing because of their not obeying the voice of Yahweh (Deut 8:19-20).

4.23 Taking possession of a city, lacking righteousness, breaking the commandments, fasting, reacting to a sin, and leading out the Israelites (2 Sam 2-5; cf. Deut 9)

The sequence of the motifs of taking possession of a city, lacking righteousness, breaking the commandments, fasting, reacting to a sin, and leading out the Israelites (2 Sam 2-5) originates from Deut 9.

In particular, the thought that David took possession of Hebron, one of the great cities (ערים) of Judaea (2 Sam 2:1-4), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should take possession of the great cities of Canaan (Deut 9:1). The subsequent, somewhat surprisingly introduced thought that the people of Jabesh-gilead should be strong and valiant (2 Sam 2:7) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites standing up to the giants Anakim (Deut 9:2-3).

The subsequent story about a hard (קשה) and indecent way of fighting of the armies of Joab on the one hand and of Abner with Ishbosheth on the other (2 Sam 2:8-3:1) illustrates the Deuteronomic ideas concerning the Israelites as defeating their enemies not because of their righteousness (Deut 9:4-6) and as being a hard-necked people (Deut 9:6). Additionally, the motif of Ishbosheth, that is Esh-baal (1 Chr 8:33; 9:39), as the king of Israel (2 Sam 2:8-4:12) alludes to the motif of idolatry, more precisely worship of Baal, in Israel (Deut 9:12.16.21). The Judaean author of 2 Samuel repeatedly presented Israel's royal dynasty as involved in the shameful, idolatrous worship of Baal (2 Sam 2:8-4:12; 9:6-13; 11:21; 19:25-31; 21:7-8). The somewhat surprisingly introduced idea of David as having sons in Hebron (2 Sam 3:2-5)[39] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites inheriting the land of Canaan (Deut 9:4-6).

---

39 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 200.

The subsequent story about breaking the commandments of the Decalogue which concern honouring one's father, committing adultery, stealing, and committing murder (2 Sam 3:6-30) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of breaking the tablets of the Decalogue (Deut 9:7-17; cf. 5:6-21). The subsequent thought that David and all the people lamented because of the committed sin (2 Sam 3:31-34) and that David refrained from eating bread (לחם) during the day (יום: 2 Sam 3:35-37), but that he also rebuked the Israelites (2 Sam 3:38-39), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Moses prayed and did not eat bread for forty days, but he also rebuked the Israelites (Deut 9:18-21).

The subsequent account of a repeated murder in Israel and of David's reaction to it (2 Sam 4) alludes to the Deuteronomic account of the repeated sins of the Israelites and of Moses' reaction to them (Deut 9:22-25). The author of 2 Samuel understandably reworked the idea of Moses' priestly reaction to the Israelites' sin (Deut 9:25-29) into that of David's kingly reaction to the Israelites' sin (2 Sam 4:9-12). The name Beeroth (2 Sam 4:2; cf. 4:3.5.9) may allude to the name Beeroth in Deut 10:6, which may be regarded as pointing to the location of the account Deut 9:25-29. Additionally, the motif of Mephibosheth (2 Sam 4:4), that is Merib-baal or Meri-baal (1 Chr 8:34; 9:40), alludes to the motif of provoking Yahweh to wrath (Deut 9:22).

The story about David as powerfully, with the help of Yahweh, leading out (יצא) the Israelites and as assuming authority over all Israel, which was regarded as Yahweh's people (עם: 2 Sam 5:1-12), alludes to the Deuteronomic motifs of Israel regarded as Yahweh's people, powerful help of Yahweh to the Israelites, Yahweh powerfully bringing out the Israelites, and the land of Canaan regarded as promised to Israel (Deut 9:26-28). The somewhat redundantly introduced account of David having sons in Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:13-16)[40] probably alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of having inheritance in Israel (Deut 9:26.29). The concluding account of Yahweh powerfully helping and leading out (יצא) the Israelites in their desperate war against their mightier enemies Philistines (2 Sam 5:17-25) illustrates the likewise concluding motif of Yahweh powerfully helping and bringing out the Israelites (Deut 9:29).

40 Cf. ibid. 220.

4.24 Quasi-Levitical way of dealing with the ark (2 Sam 6; cf. Deut 10:1-11)

The story about the quasi-Levitical way of dealing with the ark (2 Sam 6) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 10:1-11.

In particular, the idea of David as arising (קום) and going (הלך) as a leader at the head of the people (2 Sam 6:2; cf. 6:5.14-15), so that the Israelites came (ויבאו) to the established (כון) threshing floor, which roughly corresponded to the future sanctuary of Yahweh (2 Sam 6:6; cf. 24:16-25), originates from Deut 10:11 (cf. Exod 15:17; 23:20; 1 Kgs 6:19; 1 Chr 15:1.3.12; 2 Chr 1:4; 3:1).

The motif of going up (עלה) with the ark (2 Sam 6:2.12.15) originates from Deut 10:1.3. The related motif of the ark (ארון) of God (2 Sam 6:2-7.12) and thereafter, with more precision, of the ark of Yahweh (ארון יהוה: 2 Sam 6:9-17) was borrowed from Deut 10:1-3.5.8. The name Baale-judah (cf. earlier Esh-baal and Merib-baal in 2 Sam 2-4), which refers to the place from which the ark had to be brought (2 Sam 6:2; cf. Josh 15:9-11.60; 18:14; 1 Chr 13:6; diff. 1 Sam 6:21-7:2), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that making the ark corresponded to overcoming the Israelites' sin of idolatry (Deut 10:1-2; cf. 9:12-21).

The idea of carrying (נשא) the ark (2 Sam 6:3-4.13) was borrowed from Deut 10:8. The subsequent motif of David dancing and worshipping before Yahweh (לפני יהוה) in a priestly ephod (2 Sam 6:5.13-17.21) originates from the subsequent Deuteronomic idea of the Levites as standing and ministering before Yahweh (Deut 10:8). The related, strange thought that David and all the house of Israel played before the ark of Yahweh with cypress wood (עצי: 2 Sam 6:5; diff. 1 Chr 13:8)[41] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of making the ark and other cultic objects out of wood (Deut 10:1.3; cf. 1 Kgs 5:22.24; 6:15.34; 9:11).

The surprising thought that Yahweh killed the layman Uzzah who touched the ark (2 Sam 6:6-8; cf. 6:3), but spared his brother Ahio who, like David and other Israelites, went before the ark (2 Sam 6:4; cf. 6:5.14.16-17.21),[42] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh set apart the tribe of Levi to carry the ark (Deut 10:8). The related idea of the restriction concerning the admission of

---

41 Cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 294; S. Bar-Efrat, *Das Zweite Buch Samuel: Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar*, trans. J. Klein (BWANT 181; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2009), 67; D. P. Wright, 'Music and Dance in 2 Samuel 6', *JBL* 121 (2002) 201-225 (esp. 204-205).

42 Cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 292-293; Y. Szedlàk-Michel, 'Die Hüter der Lade', in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke*, 152-167 (esp. 158-159, 162).

only the tribe of Levi to direct contact with the ark as valid to this day (עד היום הזה: 2 Sam 6:8; cf. 6:9-12; cf. also 6:23) was likewise borrowed from Deut 10:8.

The idea of blessing the people in the name of Yahweh (ברך + בשם + יהוה: 2 Sam 6:18) was borrowed from Deut 10:8. The subsequent thought that David distributed portions (חלק) among all the people, but he himself was satisfied with Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam 6:19-20), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Levites have no portion with their kindred (Deut 10:9).

Accordingly, in his reworking of Deut 10:1-11 in 2 Sam 6, the author of 2 Samuel described David as a quasi-Levitical king,[43] in line with the thought that the Israelites are a priestly kingdom (Exod 19:6; cf. Deut 17:18).

4.25 Being chosen from among the nations (2 Sam 7; cf. Deut 10:12-16)

The story about David as thanking Yahweh for particularly choosing him, his house, and Israel (2 Sam 7) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 10:12-16.

In particular, the thought that David loved Yahweh and served Yahweh in his heart (לבב: 2 Sam 7:2-3) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should love Yahweh and serve him with all their hearts (Deut 10:12; cf. 10:16). The related, repeatedly used motif of David being a servant (עבד) of Yahweh (2 Sam 7:5.8.19-21.25-29) likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should serve Yahweh (Deut 10:12).

The motif of this day (יום הזה) as the time of the narrated present (2 Sam 7:6) was borrowed from Deut 10:15.

The motif of Yahweh particularly choosing the people (עם) of Israel from among all the nations on earth (2 Sam 7:6-7.10.22-24.26-27) was borrowed from Deut 10:15. However, with the use of the combination of the motifs of someone's ancestors (אבתיך) and of chosen offspring after (זרע אחרי) someone (2 Sam 7:12), a combination which was likewise borrowed from Deut 10:15, and with the use of traditional royal ideology (2 Sam 7:13-16; cf. e.g. Ps 2:7), the Judaean author of 2 Samuel developed the idea of Yahweh as particularly choosing the people of Israel (2 Sam 7:6-7.10.22-24.26-27) into that of Yahweh as particularly choosing the Judaean royal dynasty (2 Sam 7:8-9.11-16.18-21.25-29).

---

43 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 331-333.

4.26 Yahweh being mighty and awesome, dedicating gifts to Yahweh, and administering justice (2 Sam 8; cf. Deut 10:17-18)

The combination of the motifs of Yahweh being mighty and awesome, hallowing gifts to Yahweh, and establishing justice (2 Sam 8) originates from Deut 10:17.

In particular, the surprising description of David as powerfully, humblingly, and cruelly treating his enemies with the help of Yahweh (2 Sam 8:1-6.13-14) illustrates the motif of Yahweh being great, mighty, and awesome (Deut 10:17).

The thought that David took (לקח) Gentile weapons and brought them to Jerusalem, but dedicated them to Yahweh (2 Sam 8:7-8.10-12), probably alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh takes no bribe (Deut 10:17). The concluding thought that David, together with Jehoshaphat, Zadok, and others, administered justice (עשׂה משפט) in Israel with the help of Yahweh (2 Sam 8:15-18; cf. 8:14) likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh shows no partiality, takes no bribe, and administers justice (Deut 10:17-18).

4.27 Justice and love for orphans, widows, and strangers; and taking oaths in the name of Yahweh (2 Sam 9:1-12:25; cf. Deut 10:18-20)

The combination of the motifs of justice and love for orphans, widows, and strangers, and of taking oaths in the name of Yahweh (2 Sam 9:1-12:25) originates from Deut 10:18-20.

In particular, the thought that David gave (נתן) bread (לחם) to the orphaned and crippled Mephibosheth (2 Sam 9:7.9-10; cf. 9:11.13; cf. also 12:8) alludes to the thought that Yahweh gives bread to the orphan (Deut 10:18). The subsequent story about David as showing kindness to the orphaned and estranged but divinely 'favoured' Hanun, and thereafter to his warriors (2 Sam 10:1-4.13-14.18-19),[44] illustrates the same thought that Yahweh gives bread to the orphan and stranger (Deut 10:18). Accordingly, the author of 2 Samuel presented the

44 Cf. R. G. Smith, *The Fate of Justice and Righteousness during David's Reign: Rereading the Court History and Its Ethics according to 2 Samuel 8:15b-20:26* (LHBOTS 508; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009), 110-118.

character of David as partly embodying the features of the invisible Yahweh (cf. esp. 2 Sam 9:1.3).

The subsequent story about David's loving the 'widowed' Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:1-5.26-27; 12:24; cf. 1 Kgs 1:28-31), about his killing the stranger Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam 11:6-26), and about Yahweh's just reaction to this sin (2 Sam 11:27-12:19; cf. 12:20.22-23) illustrates the idea of Yahweh as administering justice to the widow and to the stranger (Deut 10:18; cf. 10:19). The narratively redundant and somewhat surprising name Bathsheba (בת־שׁבע: 2 Sam 11:3; 12:24; diff. 11:26; 12:15)[45] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should take oaths (שׁבע) in the name of Yahweh (Deut 18:20). The thought that David took an oath in the name of Yahweh (2 Sam 12:5)[46] likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should take oaths in the name of Yahweh (Deut 10:20). The surprising idea of the suffering David as changing clothes (שׂמלה) and eating bread (לחם) after the death of his child (2 Sam 12:20-21; cf. 12:15-19.22-23)[47] may allude to the idea of Yahweh as giving bread to the orphan (Deut 10:18). The thought that David, in difference to Bathsheba, gave to his son the name (שׁם) Jedidiah, because of Yahweh (2 Sam 12:24-25; cf. also 12:28), once again illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should take oaths in the name of Yahweh (Deut 10:20).

4.28 Being like stars in heaven, doing awesome things to Israel's enemies, and reversing the situation of Egypt (2 Sam 12:26-31; cf. Deut 10:21-22)

The combination of the motifs of being like stars in heaven, doing awesome things to Israel's enemies, and reversing the situation of Egypt (2 Sam 12:26-31) originates from Deut 10:21-22.

---

45 Cf. A. E. Gardner, 'The Identity of Bath-sheba', *RB* 112 (2005) 521-535 (esp. 524).

46 Cf. Y. Ziegler, *Promises*, 229-231.

47 Cf. A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel* (WBC 11; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1989), 164; J. J. Quesada, 'King David and Tidings of Death: "Character Response" Criticism', in T. Linafelt, C. V. Camp, and T. Beal (eds.), *The Fate of King David: The Past and Present of a Biblical Icon* (LHBOTS 500; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 3-18 (esp. 12-13); D. Bosworth, '"David Comforted Bathsheba" (2 Sam 12:24): Gender and Parental Bereavement', in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke*, 238-255 (esp. 244).

In particular, the thought that David took Rabbah (רבה: 2 Sam 12:26-29; cf. 11:1) and that he brought out of it a great number (רבה) of spoils (2 Sam 12:30) may allude to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh made the Israelites very numerous (רב: Deut 10:22). Similarly, the image of placing a crown made of gold and precious stones on David's head (2 Sam 12:30) probably alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of Yahweh making the Israelites like stars in heaven (Deut 10:22).

The thought that David set (שׂים) the Ammonites as the Israelites' slaves (2 Sam 12:31) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh set the Israelites as a numerous and powerful people (Deut 10:22). The particular idea of forcing the Ammonites to perform hard works done with iron construction tools, as well as brickworks (מלבן: 2 Sam 12:31), alludes to the situation of the descendants of the seventy sons of Israel, who became numerous in Egypt and who were forced to build cities and work in brick (Exod 1:1.5.7.11-14: לבנה), thus illustrating the Deuteronomic idea of the reversal of the situation of the Israelites in Egypt (Deut 10:22). The thought that David did (עשׂה) awesome things to the Ammonites (2 Sam 12:31; cf. 10:19) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh did great and awesome things to Israel's enemies (Deut 10:21).

4.29 Sons not knowing the discipline of Yahweh (2 Sam 13-19; cf. Deut 11:1-5)

The stories about David's sons, who committed grave sins because they did not know any discipline (2 Sam 13-19), originate from a hypertextual reworking of Deut 11:1-5.

In particular, the motif of David's young sons (בן) Amnon and Absalom, as well as Shimeah's likewise young son (בן) Jonadab, who committed grave sins because they did not know any discipline (2 Sam 13-19),[48] illustrates the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites' sons as not knowing Yahweh's punishing discipline (Deut 11:2). The idea of the young Absalom as not seeing (לא ראה) David's angry face (2 Sam 14:24.28; cf. 14:32-33) likewise illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' sons as not seeing Yahweh's punishing discipline (Deut 11:2).

---

48 Cf. J. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2009), 343.

The surprising description of Absalom's army as equipped with chariots (מרכבה) and horses (סוס: 2 Sam 15:1) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of the Egyptian army as equipped with horses and chariots (רכב: Deut 11:4). The thought that the main task of a king consists in pronouncing right judgements (משׁפט: 2 Sam 15:2.4.6) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should keep Yahweh's judgements (Deut 11:1). The idea of the young Absalom as not having a ruler's mighty hand (חזק + יד: 2 Sam 15:5) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites' sons as not knowing Yahweh's mighty hand (Deut 11:2).

The thought that David escaped before the new king (מלך) to the wilderness (מדבר: 2 Sam 15:10.19.23.28.34-35; 16:2.16; 17:16; 18:18) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites escaped before the king of Egypt to the wilderness (Deut 11:3.5). The description of the armies of David and Absalom as crossing water (מים: 2 Sam 17:16.20-22.24) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as being saved beyond the water of the Sea of Reeds (Deut 11:4). The surprising thought that David's army was fed in the wilderness (מדבר: 2 Sam 17:27-29)[49] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites saw Yahweh's miraculous help in the wilderness (Deut 11:5).

The idea of a great (גדול) slaughter of the enemy army (2 Sam 18:8) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of seeing Yahweh's greatness (Deut 11:2). The surprising images of Absalom's army as mainly destroyed by a thicket (2 Sam 18:8; cf. Josh 10:11) and of Absalom as halted by a tree (2 Sam 18:9)[50] allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Egyptian army was overflowed by the Sea of Reeds (Deut 11:4). The idea of remembering the destruction of Absalom to this day (עד היום הזה: 2 Sam 18:18) likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the destruction of the Egyptian army to this day (Deut 11:4).

The thought that David wanted to remove the iniquitous Joab from his office for all time (כל־הימים: 2 Sam 19:14) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites should do Yahweh's justice in all time (Deut 11:1). The thought that old David, and not his young son, knew (ידע) his position in the eyes of Yahweh on that day (היום), after Yahweh showed him his chastisements (2 Sam 19:23; cf. 14:22; 19:7.21.36), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the old generation of the Israelites, and not their sons, knew Yahweh's chastisements (Deut 11:2).

---

49 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 374; I. Willi-Plein, 'Barsillai der Gileaditer', in M. Pietsch and F. Hartenstein (eds.), *Israel zwischen den Mächten*, Festschrift S. Timm (AOAT 364; Ugarit: Münster 2009), 455-472 (esp. 458-460).

50 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Saga*, 317-318.

The idea of David and the people of Israel as finally coming (בוא) to Jerusalem (2 Sam 19:31.42) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as finally coming to their place (Deut 11:5).

4.30 Punishing two rebellious Israelites (2 Sam 20:1-22; cf. Deut 11:6-7)

The story about punishing two rebellious Israelites Amasa and Sheba (2 Sam 20:1-22; esp. 20:1-2.5.19.21; cf. 17:25) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 11:6-7, which refers to punishing two rebellious Israelites Dathan and Abiram.

In particular, the thought that every rebellious Israelite should go to his tents (אהלים: 2 Sam 20:1; cf. 20:22) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the earth swallowed up the rebels' tents (Deut 11:6).

The idea of punishing Amasa at a great (גדול) stone (2 Sam 20:8) may allude to the Deuteronomic idea of a great punishing deed of Yahweh (Deut 11:7). The thought that Amasa's entrails poured out on the ground (ארץ: 2 Sam 20:10), and consequently they were 'swallowed up' by the earth, which happened in the midst of passing warriors (2 Sam 20:11-13), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the earth swallowed up the Israelite rebels in the midst of all Israel (Deut 11:6). The thought that every passing person saw (ראה) the punished Amasa (2 Sam 20:12) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that everyone saw the punishing of the Israelite rebels (Deut 11:7). The name of the punished Amasa (עמשׂא: 2 Sam 20:12) may additionally allude to the Deuteronomic idea of a punishing deed (מעשׂה) of Yahweh (Deut 11:7).

The thought that Joab passed through all the tribes of Israel (ישׂראל) in order to punish Sheba (2 Sam 20:14) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelite rebels were punished in the midst of all Israel (Deut 11:6). The idea of conquering the rebellious Israelite city by means of besieging it and heaping up an assault ramp against it (2 Sam 20:15) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the earth as swallowing up the rebellious Israelites (Deut 11:6). The surprising thought that Joab wanted to swallow up (בלע) the rebellious principal city within Israel (ישׂראל: 2 Sam 20:19-20; cf. 20:21: Ephraim) likewise alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the earth swallowed up the main Israelite rebels in the midst of all Israel (Deut 11:6). Similarly, the idea of punishing Sheba within the Israelite city (2 Sam 20:21-22) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of punishing the rebels in the midst of all Israel (Deut 11:6).

4.31 Being strong, suffering from hunger because of sins, obeying Yahweh's commandment, and awaiting water from the heavens (2 Sam 20:23-21:14; cf. Deut 11:8-17)

The combination of the motifs of being strong, suffering from hunger because of sins, obeying Yahweh's commandment, and awaiting water from the heavens (2 Sam 20:23-21:14) originates from Deut 11:8-17.

In particular, the repeated, somewhat changed list of David's officials (2 Sam 20:23-26; cf. 8:16-18) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of keeping Yahweh's commandment and being strong enough to go in and take possession of the land of Canaan (Deut 11:8), an idea which caused reordering, additions, and changes of various names on the list of David's officials, in order to emphasize military offices and de-emphasize administrative and cultic functions (2 Sam 20:23-26; diff. 8:16-18).[51]

The motif of suffering from three-year-long hunger because of Israel's sins (2 Sam 21:1-9; cf. 21:14) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will shut up the heavens, so that there will be no rain and the land will yield no produce, because of Israel's sins (Deut 11:16-17).

The motif of the beginning of barley harvest (2 Sam 21:9-10) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as caring for the land of Israel from the beginning of the year (Deut 11:12; cf. Ruth 2:23). The subsequent description of Rizpah's absolute obedience to the Deuteronomic rule which concerned burying the one who was hanged (2 Sam 21:9-14; cf. Deut 21:23)[52] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should earnestly obey Yahweh's commandments (Deut 11:13). The idea of Rizpah as awaiting water (מים) from the heavens (השמים: 2 Sam 21:10) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the land of Israel as drinking water from the heaven (Deut 11:11; cf. 11:10.14-15). The thought that God heeded supplications for the land (ארץ) only when the Deuteronomic rule which concerned burying the one who was hanged (Deut 21:23) was obeyed (2 Sam 21:12-14) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that God

51 Cf. J. Vermeylen, *Loi*, 398-399.

52 Cf. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 376; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 488; *pace* C. M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1985), 150-151.

will give rain for the land of Israel if the Israelites earnestly obey his commandments (Deut 11:13-14).

4.32 Driving out the Gentiles from the borders of Israel, teaching words to children, and causing fear among the Gentiles (2 Sam 21:15-23:39; cf. Deut 11:18-25)

The combination of the motifs of driving out the Gentiles from the borders of Israel, teaching words to children, and causing fear among the Gentiles (2 Sam 21:15-23:39) originates from Deut 11:18-25.

In particular, the narratively somewhat redundant account of the victories of the tired David and his servants over the great and mighty Philistines at Gob and Gath (2 Sam 21:15-22; cf. 1 Sam 17)[53] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will drive out the great and mighty Gentiles from within the ideal borders of Israel (Deut 11:23-24).

The motifs of speaking (דבר) words (דברים) of a song and of the hero's last words (2 Sam 22:1; cf. 22:2-51; 23:1-7) were borrowed from Deut 31:30-32:43; 33:1-29 in order to illustrate the Deuteronomic ideas of the Israelites as putting Yahweh's words in their hearts, teaching Yahweh's words to their children, and speaking of Yahweh's words on all occasions (Deut 11:18-19). The subsequent motif of Yahweh's temple (2 Sam 22:7; cf. 22:2-6) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic motif of doorposts and gates (Deut 11:20). The subsequent motif of the earth (הארץ) and the heavens (השׁמים: 2 Sam 22:8; cf. 22:9-20) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic motif of the heavens above the earth (Deut 11:21). The subsequent motif of keeping (שׁמר) Yahweh's ways and judgements (2 Sam 22:22-24; cf. 22:21.25-27) alludes to the subsequent Deuteronomic motif of keeping Yahweh's commandments (Deut 11:22). Likewise, the sequence of the ideas concerning Yahweh as girding the Israelite with strength, making his way (דרך) perfect, and making his feet (רגלים) like those of deer (2 Sam 22:33-34; cf. 22:28-32.35-51) alludes to the sequence of the Deuteronomic ideas concerning Yahweh as making the Israelites mightier than their enemies, and as giving to the Israelites every Gentile place which is trodden (דרך) by their feet (Deut 11:23-24).

---

53 Cf. A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel*, 254.

The subsequent, narratively somewhat redundant list of David's warriors and of their awesome deeds against the Gentiles (2 Sam 23:8-39; cf. 1 Sam 17 etc.)[54] illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as causing fear among the Gentiles (Deut 11:25). The particular thought that Shammah took his stand (יתיצב) in the face (פנה) of the mightier Philistines (2 Sam 23:11-12) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that no one will take his stand in the face of the Israelites (Deut 11:25).

4.33 Blessing and curse, and Yahweh's holy place (2 Sam 24; cf. Deut 11:26-32)

The combination of the motifs of a blessing and a curse, and of Yahweh's holy place (2 Sam 24) originates from Deut 11:26-32.

In particular, the somewhat surprising thought that David did not know (ידע) the number of the people (2 Sam 24:2-9; diff. Num 1:1-46; 3:15-43)[55] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites have not known other gods, which were forbidden to them (Deut 11:28). The idea of David as seeing (ראה) before (לפני) him a result of Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam 24:3-4; cf. 24:22) and thereafter a result of Yahweh's curse (2 Sam 24:13.17) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as seeing before them Yahweh's blessing and Yahweh's curse (Deut 11:26). Likewise, the idea of giving (נתן) to David a result of Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam 24:9; cf. 24:23) and thereafter a result of Yahweh's curse (2 Sam 24:15) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as giving to the Israelites a blessing and a curse (Deut 11:26; cf. 11:29).

The thought that Joab and the commanders of the army went through all the land (הארץ) of Israel (2 Sam 24:4-9)[56] illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh brought the Israelites into the land which they should possess (Deut 11:29). The particular idea of Joab as coming to the land (ארץ) of the Canaanites (הכנעני: 2 Sam 24:7; cf. 24:6) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites coming to the land of the Canaanites (Deut 11:30). In the presentation of the Judaean author of 2 Samuel, the whole Israelite territory, which was located

54 Cf. ibid. 274.

55 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 475.

56 Cf. W. Linke, 'Spis ludności za Dawida w różnych interpretacjach teologicznych', *STV* 47 (2009) 139-166 (esp. 150-151).

between Tyre and Judaea, should be regarded as a Hivite and Canaanite, that is generally Gentile, region (2 Sam 24:7; cf. 2 Kgs 17:24-41).

The thought that David obeyed what Yahweh had commanded (צוה: 2 Sam 24:19) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should obey Yahweh's commandments (מצוה: Deut 11:27). The thought that David crossed over (עבר) and came (בוא) there (שׁם), that is to the place of the altar of Yahweh (2 Sam 24:20-25; cf. 24:5-8), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should cross over the Jordan and come there, that is to the place of the altar of Yahweh (Deut 11:29-31; cf. 27:4-7). The Judaean author of 2 Samuel evidently changed the Deuteronomy-based location of the unique altar of Yahweh in Israel: from Shechem (Deut 11:29-12:31; cf. 27:4-7; Gen 12:6-7; 22:2.9; Josh 8:30-31) to Jerusalem (2 Sam 24:16-25).

4.34 King over Israel and his numerous wives, wise judging, food contributions, the temple of Yahweh, and three feasts a year (1 Kgs 1:1-11:4; cf. Deut 12:1-18:8)

The combination of the motifs of the king over Israel and his numerous wives, wise judging, food contributions, the temple of Yahweh, the priests and the Levites standing and ministering Yahweh, and three feasts a year (1 Kgs 1:1-11:4) originates from Deut 12:1-18:8.

In particular, the idea of the peaceful Solomon (e.g. 1 Kgs 1:52-53; 4:2-6 diff. 2 Sam 20:23-26) as a successor to the militant David after forty years of the latter's rule over Israel (1 Kgs 1-5; esp. 2:11-12; cf. also 11:42) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of the new, settled generation of the Israelites as successors to the militant generation of Joshua (cf. e.g. Deut 11:18-12:1). The thought that Solomon, who was chosen by David (1 Kgs 1:33-35) and by Yahweh (1 Kgs 1:39.48; 2:3-4.15.24), and not the Egyptian-style royal pretender Adonijah who exalted himself (1 Kgs 1:5), was set as the king (מלך) over (על) Israel (1 Kgs 1:5-2:25; esp. 1:34; cf. also 4:1; 6:1; 11:42) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the king over Israel should be chosen by Yahweh and that he should not cause the people to return to Egypt (Deut 17:15-16).

The motif of exhorting Solomon to keep Yahweh's statutes (שׁמר + חק: 1 Kgs 2:3; 3:14; 6:12; 8:58; 9:4; cf. 8:61; 9:6; cf. 11:11.34.38) originates from the Deuteronomic motif of exhorting Israel's king to keep Yahweh's statutes

(Deut 17:19; cf. 12:1; 16:12). The related thought that Solomon should obey the written (כתב) law (תורה) of Moses (1 Kgs 2:3) illustrates the related Deuteronomic thought that Israel's king should write for himself a copy of Moses' law (Deut 17:18-19).[57]

The thought that Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter (1 Kgs 3:1; 7:8; 9:16.24; 11:1) in a negative way alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Israel's king should not cause the people to return to Egypt (Deut 17:16).

The motif of Solomon as the supreme, wise judge (שׁפט) in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 3:9.11.16-28; 7:7; cf. 8:31-32.59; 10:9) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of priestly-Levitical judges as officiating in Yahweh's sanctuary (Deut 17:8-12; cf. 16:18-19). In particular, the account of Solomon judging a case of a dead child and a living child (1 Kgs 3:16-28) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that these judges should pronounce judgements in more difficult cases, like that of bloodshed (Deut 17:8). Accordingly, the author of 1 Kings presented Solomon, similarly to David (2 Sam 6), as a quasi-Levitical king.

The idea of Solomon as receiving food contributions from the whole land of Israel (1 Kgs 4:7-5:8) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as bringing tithes to the sanctuary (Deut 14:22-27). The related idea that notwithstanding these contributions the Israelites ate, drank, and rejoiced (אכל + שׂמח: 1 Kgs 4:20) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites as eating, drinking, and rejoicing at the time of their bringing the tithe to the sanctuary (Deut 14:26; cf. 12:6-7.17-18). The thought that Solomon ate oxen, sheep, deer (איל), gazelles (צבי), roebucks (יחמור), and fatted (i.e. not wild) fowl (1 Kgs 5:3) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should only eat clean animals, especially oxen, sheep, deer, gazelles, roebucks, and domesticated birds (Deut 14:4-5.11.20). The thought that Solomon had many horses (סוסים), especially imported from Egypt (1 Kgs 5:6.8; 10:25-26.28-29), points to the violation of the Deuteronomic rule that Israel's king should not acquire many horses and not cause the people to return to Egypt (Deut 17:16).[58] The idea of Solomon as speaking of animals (בהמה), birds (עוף), creeping things, and fish (1 Kgs 5:13) alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas concerning the Israelites as being obliged to clearly discern between clean and unclean animals, fish, birds, and swarms, and

---

57 Cf. F. García López, 'La muerte de Moisés, la sucesión de Josué y la escritura de la Tôrah (Deuteronomio 31-34)', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (BETL 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 85-99 (esp. 98).

58 Cf. J. D. Hays, 'Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11', *JSOT* 28.2 (2003) 149-174 (esp. 157).

as being prohibited to make images of such creatures (Deut 14:4-20; cf. 4:17-18).

In particular, the description of Solomon as building the temple of Yahweh in the place (מקום) which was specially chosen (בחר) by Yahweh from all the tribes (מכל שׁבטי) of Israel (1 Kgs 5:15-9:24; esp. 5:23; 8:6-7.16.21.29-30.35.44.48) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should offer sacrifices to Yahweh in only one place, which will be chosen by him (Deut 12:4-28). The thought that this temple should be regarded as a temple for Yahweh's name (שׁם: 1 Kgs 5:17.19; 8:16-20.29.43-44.48; 9:3.7; cf. 3:2; 11:36), so that Yahweh's name might be there (שׁם: 1 Kgs 8:16.21.29.64; 9:3; cf. 5:23; 6:19; 11:36), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will put his name there, that is in his sanctuary (Deut 12:5.11.21; 14:23-24; 16:2.6.11 etc.). The surprising idea of building Solomon's temple with unhewn stones and with no iron tool (1 Kgs 6:7; diff. 2 Sam 12:31) alludes to the Deuteronomic rule concerning building the altar of Yahweh with unhewn stones (Deut 27:5-6). The Judaean author of 1 Kings rhetorically justified the location of Yahweh's chosen temple in Jerusalem (esp. 1 Kgs 8:16) and not at Shechem (cf. Deut 11:29; 27:4-7).

The idea of seven years (שׁבע שׁנים) of building the temple (1 Kgs 6:38) alludes to the Deuteronomic regulations concerning the seventh year (Deut 15:1-18). Likewise, the idea of rejoicingly (שׂמח) celebrating a festival (חג) in the seventh month, for apparently twice seven days (שׁבעת ימים: 1 Kgs 8:2.65-66), illustrates the repeated Deuteronomic regulation concerning rejoicingly celebrating the festival of booths for seven days (Deut 16:13; cf. 16:15).

The thought that the priests (הכהנים) and the Levites (הלוים) would stand (לעמד) and minister (לשׁרת) before Yahweh while Solomon sacrificed (זבח) sheep and oxen (1 Kgs 8:3-6.10-11; cf. 8:62-63) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the priests and the Levites were chosen to stand and to minister in the name of Yahweh, and to receive their portions of the sacrificed bulls and sheep (Deut 18:1.3.5-7; cf. Exod 40:34-35). The thought that Solomon offered burnt offerings (עלה) in the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 8:64; 9:25; 10:5) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that burnt offerings should only be offered in the one legal sanctuary of Yahweh (Deut 12:6.11.13-14.26-27). The image of Solomon as offering burnt offerings (עלה) and peace offerings three times a year (שׁלשׁ פעמים בשׁנה: 1 Kgs 9:25) illustrates the Deuteronomic regulations concerning celebrating festivals three times a year (Deut 16:16; cf. Num 29:39).

The thought that king Solomon acquired a great quantity (מאד + רבה) of spices, precious stones, gold, and silver (כסף + זהב: 1 Kgs 10:10-11.21-22.25) illustrates the violation of the Deuteronomic rule concerning Israel's king (Deut 17:17).[59] Likewise, the thought that king Solomon had many wives (נשׁים), who turned his heart (לבב) away from Yahweh (1 Kgs 11:1-4; cf. 11:8), illustrates the punishable violation of the Deuteronomic rule concerning Israel's king (Deut 17:17).[60]

4.35 Idolatry in Israel (1 Kgs 11:5-16:34; cf. Deut 18:9-14)

The section concerning the rise of idolatry in Israel (1 Kgs 11:5-16:34) is a hypertextual reworking of Deut 18:9-14.

In particular, the thought that the Israelites began to practice various forms of idolatry and illicit worship of Yahweh (1 Kgs 11:5-8.10.33; 12:25-33; 13:33; 14:9.23-24; 15:13-14; 16:13.26.31-33; cf. 2 Kgs 1:2-3.6.16; 9:22; 16:3; 17:17.31; 18:4; 21:6 etc.) alludes to the Deuteronomic prohibitions of practising various forms of idolatry (Deut 18:10-11.14).

The particular thought that Yahweh will root up the Israelites from their land because of (בגלל) the sins of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:15-16) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh drove out the nations from the land of Israel because of their abominations (Deut 18:12). Likewise, the idea of the sinners in the land (ארץ) as doing according to the abominations of the nations (עשׂה + כ + תועבת + הגוים) which Yahweh drove out before the Israelites (ירשׁ + יהוה + מפני: 1 Kgs 14:24) originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic ideas of not doing according to the abominations of the nations (Deut 18:9) and of Yahweh as driving out the nations before the Israelites (Deut 18:12).

---

59 Cf. ibid.

60 Cf. ibid.

4.36 Prophet like Moses (1 Kgs 17:1 – 2 Kgs 2:15; cf. Deut 18:15-22)

The section concerning Elijah, who functioned as the prophet like Moses in Israel (1 Kgs 17:1 – 2 Kgs 2:15) is a result of a sequential hypertextual reworking of Deut 18:15-22.

In particular, the thought that Elijah was a true, outstanding, and in some way unique prophet (נביא) of Yahweh, a prophet who was particularly chosen by Yahweh from among the Israelites and their prophets (1 Kgs 17:1-18:22), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will raise up a prophet from among the Israelites (Deut 18:15; cf. 18:18). The subsequent description of the powerful, Mosaic-like activity of Elijah (1 Kgs 18:23-46)[61] in a narrative way suggests that he functioned as a prophet like Moses, in line with the Deuteronomic idea of Deut 18:15 (cf. 18:18). The subsequent command to arise (קום), which was given to Elijah by an angel of Yahweh (1 Kgs 19:5-7; cf. 19:8; diff. 19:1-4), in a narrative way illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will raise up a prophet (Deut 18:15; cf. 18:18). The subsequent idea of recalling Yahweh's revelation to Moses at Horeb (חרב), which consisted in experiencing Yahweh's great (גדול) wind, seeing Yahweh's fire (אשׁ), hearing (שׁמע) Yahweh's voice (קול), and nevertheless not dying (מות: 1 Kgs 19:8-18; cf. 19:4), alludes to Deut 18:16.[62] The subsequent thought that Yahweh raised up Elisha, from the midst of his evidently Israelite household, as a prophet (נביא) like Elijah (1 Kgs 19:15-21) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought expressed in Deut 18:18a.

The subsequent story about obeying the instruction of a prophet (נביא) of Yahweh (1 Kgs 20:1-34; esp. 20:13.22) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of obeying the words which were put by Yahweh in the mouth of his prophet (Deut 18:18b). The subsequent stories about divinely punishing those who did not obey the words (דבר) which were spoken (דבר) in the name of Yahweh by his true prophets (1 Kgs 20:35-21:29; esp. 20:35.38.41; cf. also 21:17.19.23.27-28) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will require account of the person who does not obey Yahweh's words which the prophet speaks in Yahweh's name (Deut 18:19).

---

61 Cf. K. L. Roberts, 'God, Prophet, and King: Eating and Drinking on the Mountain in First Kings 18:41', *CBQ* 62 (2000) 632-644 (esp. 634-638).

62 Cf. S. J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (WBC 12; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2003), 209; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (WBC 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001), 406.

The subsequent story about prophets (נביא) who only presumed to speak (דבר) in Yahweh's name, a presumption which could be recognized by the fact that the things which had been foretold by these prophets did not happen (1 Kgs 22:1-38; esp. 22:6.10.12-13.22-23), illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of Deut 18:20-22.[63] In particular, the motif of a prophet speaking in the name of Yahweh (דבר + בשם יהוה: 1 Kgs 22:16; cf. 2 Kgs 2:24; 5:11) was borrowed from Deut 18:22 (cf. 18:19-20). The story about an Israelite king as inquiring the Philistine god Baal-zebub, which was punished with the penalty of death (מות: 2 Kgs 1:21-17), alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of speaking in the name of other gods, which should be punished with the penalty of death (Deut 18:20).

The story about Yahweh as providing succession to the Moses-like character of Elijah, who disappeared in Transjordan, in the Joshua-like character of the prophet Elisha, who was particularly chosen by Yahweh from among the Israelites and their prophets (2 Kgs 2:1-15) and who functioned as a prophet like Elijah (2 Kgs 2-13; cf. 1 Kgs 17 – 2 Kgs 2), again alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will raise up a prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15.18; cf. 31:14-34:12).

4.37 Sending to find someone, important cities in Israel, Moabites regarded as enemies, and needing water in the camp (2 Kgs 2:16-3:27; cf. Deut 19:1-23:15)

The combination of the motifs of sending to find someone, important cities in Israel, Moabites regarded as enemies, and needing water in the camp (2 Kgs 2:16-3:27) originates from Deut 19:1-23:15.

In particular, the somewhat surprising idea of sending (שלח) people from the city (עיר) of Jericho to find Elijah, who for the last time dwelt in Jericho, who suddenly disappeared, and who might have been put to death by the spirit of Yahweh (2 Kgs 2:16-18; cf. 2:19; diff. 2:3.5), alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of sending people from a city to find someone who fled from that city because he deserved the punishment of death (Deut 19:11-12). The idea of regarding

---

63 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 407, 410; A. van der Deijl, *Protest or Propaganda: War in the Old Testament Book of Kings and in Contemporaneous Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (SSN 51; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2008), 162, 291.

Jericho and Bethel as important cities (עיר) in Israel (2 Kgs 2:19-25) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of setting apart important and well-known cities in various regions of Israel as cities of refuge (Deut 19:1-13). The Judaean author of 2 Kings in a narrative way suggested that Yahweh's true prophet Elisha blessed the Judaean city of Jericho (2 Kgs 2:19-22; cf. 3:14; cf. Ezek 47:8-12) but cursed the Israelite city of Bethel (2 Kgs 2:23-25; cf. 3:13).

The somewhat surprising description of the war against Moab, as made by joint Israelite–Judaean–Edomite forces by the way (דרך) of the wilderness of Edom (2 Kgs 3:4-27; diff. Mesha Inscription ll. 6-8, 10-11, 18-19),[64] alludes to the Deuteronomic ideas that the Moabites shall not enter the assembly of Yahweh because they did not welcome the Israelites on their road from Egypt (Deut 23:4-7), and that the Edomites should be regarded as the Israelites' brothers (Deut 23:8). Likewise, the idea of turning a Moabite curse against the Israelites into Yahweh's prophetic blessing for them (2 Kgs 3:9-24) originates from Deut 23:6. The thought that the Israelites made a military camp (מחנה) against their enemies (2 Kgs 3:9.24) alludes to Deut 23:10-15. The related, somewhat surprising ideas of needing water (מים) in the Israelites' military camp; pouring water on the hands (יד) of Elijah; and making pools for water, and not for blood (דם) of killed (נכה) people, in a wadi (נחל) outside the camp (2 Kgs 3:9.11.16-17.20.22-23; cf. 3:19.25)[65] likewise allude to the Deuteronomic regulations concerning washing oneself with water outside the camp, maintaining cleanness of hands and of the entire Israelite camp (Deut 23:10-15), and purifying Israel from the blood of a killed person in a wadi (Deut 21:1-9).

The thought that the Israelites should strike (נכה) their enemies' fortified cities (עיר: 2 Kgs 3:19.24-25; cf. 3:23; diff. Mesha Inscription ll. 9-31)[66] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should strike the enemy cities which mount resistance to their army (Deut 20:10-20).[67] The related idea of felling every good tree (עץ: 2 Kgs 3:19.25), an idea which apparently contradicts

---

64 Cf. J. A. Emerton, 'The Value of the Moabite Stone as an Historical Source', *VT* 52 (2002) 483-492 (esp. 491); A. Kunz-Lübcke, 'Auf dem Stein und zwischen den Zeilen: Überlegungen zu einer kontrafaktischen Geschichte Israels am Beispiel von 2 Kön 3 und der Mescha-Inschrift', *BZ*, NF 51 (2007) 1-22 (esp. 2-21); E. Gass, 'Topographical Considerations and Redaction Criticism in 2 Kings 3', *JBL* 128 (2009) 65-84 (esp. 66, 72).

65 Cf. E. Gass, 'Topographical', 66-67.

66 Cf. A. Kunz-Lübcke, 'Auf dem Stein', 16-17.

67 Cf. D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 446-447.

the Deuteronomic rule concerning sparing fruit trees and making use of other trees during a siege (Deut 20:19-20),[68] alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of utterly destroying the property of the Israelites' close neighbours (Deut 20:16-18). The surprising thought that every Israelite threw a stone (אבן) on the Moabites' land and on their city (2 Kgs 3:19.25)[69] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought of executing the death penalty by means of stoning the guilty person (Deut 21:21; 22:21.24). The idea of acknowledging the status of the firstborn son (בן הבכור: 2 Kgs 3:27) in a negative way alludes to Deut 21:15-17.

4.38 Creditor, slaves not handed over, raising up a son, the son not dying because of the father, and portions of flour (2 Kgs 4; cf. Deut 23:16-25:19)

The combination of the motifs of a creditor, slaves not handed over, raising up a son, the son not dying because of the father, and portions of flour (2 Kgs 4) originates from Deut 23:16-25:19.

In particular, the thought that Elisha prevented two children of his Israelite companions from becoming slaves (עבד: 2 Kgs 4:1-7) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should not deliver slaves to their masters (Deut 23:16; cf. also 23:20-21). The idea of Yahweh's special care for a widow, especially by providing olive oil for her (2 Kgs 4:1-7), alludes to Deut 24:17.19-21 (cf. also 24:14.18). The thought that the widow's husband feared (ירא) Yahweh (2 Kgs 4:1) may negatively allude to the Deuteronomic thought that the Amalekites attacked the weak Israelites because they did not fear God (Deut 25:18). The ideas of the creditor (נשה) as coming (בוא) to the debtor's house (בית), the debtor as going outside (חוץ), and the creditor as waiting outside the closed doors (2 Kgs 4:1-5; cf. 4:7) were borrowed from Deut 24:10-11. The idea of paying (שׁלם) the debt (2 Kgs 4:7) may allude to the Deuteronomic idea of paying vows (Deut 23:22).

---

68 Cf. A. Kunz-Lübcke, 'Auf dem Stein', 15-16; A. van der Deijl, *Protest*, 186; N. Wazana, 'Are Trees of the Field Human? A Biblical War Law (Deuteronomy 20:19-20) and Neo-Assyrian Propaganda', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures*, 274-295 (esp. 294).

69 Cf. A. Kunz-Lübcke, 'Auf dem Stein', 6.

The subsequent story about providing a son for an infertile friend, with whom the prophet used to live together (2 Kgs 4:8-17), alludes to the Deuteronomic regulations which referred to providing a son for a deceased brother (Deut 24:5-10). The idea of the son (בן) as dying (מות) of a sunstroke during the harvest (קצר), a fact which was evidently not caused by a guilt of his father (אב: 2 Kgs 4:8-28; cf. 4:32.36-38), illustrates the Deuteronomic motifs of the sons not being put to death for their fathers (Deut 24:16) and of reaping the harvest (Deut 24:19). The subsequent, strange account of using a stick on the face or surface (פנים) of the dead son (בן) of the clinging woman, and thereafter coming (בוא) upon (על) the dead person, lying down and bending down in the same bed, and repeating this activity until the lying person was 'pressed out' (זרר: cf. Is 1:6) seven times and could live again (2 Kgs 4:29-37; cf. 4:10-11), originates from a conflation of the Deuteronomic ideas of punishing the guilty person (בן) by causing him to lie down and beating him in the face (of the judge) not more than forty times (Deut 25:2-3; cf. 25:11), and of coming upon the wife of the deceased brother, who lived together, in order to raise up several children after him, so that the deceased man could live in his firstborn son (Deut 25:5-10). The author of 2 Kings evidently reworked the Deuteronomic idea of prolonging one's life by means of raising up a son and thus preserving one's name in Israel (Deut 25:5-6; cf. 2 Kgs 4:8-17) into that of reviving a person from the physical death (2 Kgs 4:32-37).

The subsequent accounts concerning using portions of flour, bread, and grain instead of something that was brought in bags but could not satiate hungry people (2 Kgs 4:38-41.42-44) allude to the subsequent Deuteronomic instructions concerning not having in one's bag differing weights for measuring corn (Deut 25:13-15; cf. also 25:4).

4.39 Aramaeans, land and worship, hard labour, wonders against enemies, eating in the gate, giving to the widow, not giving to the dead, and the holy place (2 Kgs 5-8; cf. Deut 26:1-27:7)

The sequence of the motifs of the Aramaeans, land and worship, hard labour, wonders against enemies, eating in the gate, giving to the widow, not giving to the dead, and the holy place (2 Kgs 5-8) originates from Deut 26:1-27:7.

In particular, the opening story about cleansing the Aramaean (ארמי) Naaman, who was regarded as someone's father (אבי), and who was about to perish because he suffered from leprosy, but who went down (וירד) to the Jordan and became a faithful Yahwist (2 Kgs 5:1-15; cf. 5:20), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites' father was an Aramaean, who was about to perish and who went down to Egypt (Deut 26:5). The related ideas that Naaman thankfully worshipped Yahweh with the use of the earth (אדמה) of Israel (2 Kgs 5:17), and that Yahweh demanded no other gifts from him (2 Kgs 5:19-27), allude to the Deuteronomic idea of thankfully worshipping Yahweh by bringing him the produce of the earth of Israel (Deut 26:1-4; cf. 26:10-11.15).

The subsequent account of the Israelites' hard constructing work with the use of iron tools, and of their crying (צעק) in their distress to Yahweh's representative, who saw (ראה) their affliction (2 Kgs 6:1-7; cf. 2 Sam 12:31), illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites in Egypt were afflicted with hard labour, and that they cried to Yahweh, who saw their affliction (Deut 26:6-7).

The subsequent account of Elisha's wonder against the Aramaeans, who were somewhat surprisingly regarded as being at that time Israel's enemies,[70] a wonder which consisted in going out (יצא) of the place which was surrounded by the enemy army and in leading (בוא) the people to Israel's territory in which they could eat and drink delightful things during a great (גדול) feast (2 Kgs 6:8-23), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh brought the Israelites out of Egypt with great wonders, and brought them to the land flowing with milk and honey (Deut 26:8-9; cf. 26:10-11).

The subsequent story about hunger in the somewhat surprisingly besieged city of Samaria,[71] which caused the poor people to give (נתן) their most beloved ones to the most destitute ones, and which ended up in eating (אכל) the fill in the gate (שׁער) of the city and in trampling the unbelieving 'third man' (שׁליש: 2 Kgs 6:24-7:20), alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of giving the tithe of the third year to the destitute people, so that they might eat their fill within the gates of the Israelite city (Deut 26:12).

---

70 The Assyrian sources present Ahab king of Israel as allied with Hadad-ezer king of Damascus at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC: cf. *RIMA* A.0.102.2 ii 90-92 [Kurkh Monolith]. Cf. also B. Halpern, 'Archaeology, the Bible and History: The Fall of the House of Omri—and the Origins of the Israelite State', in T. E. Levy (ed.), *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* (Equinox: London · Oakville 2010), 262-284 (esp. 269-272).

71 Cf. B. Halpern, 'Archaeology', 271-272.

The subsequent story about an old, probably widowed woman who went away from her house (בית), after several years (שׁנה) became a stranger in Israel, and nevertheless was given (נתן) by the Israelite king all the produce (תבואה) of the field which was due to her (2 Kgs 8:1-6) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that in the third year the Israelite should remove from his house the tithe of his produce, and give it to the stranger and the widow (Deut 26:12-13).

The subsequent account of Hazael obeying the voice of Yahweh's representative and doing (עשׂה) according to all that he foretold, in particular blocking the old king's mouth so that he died (מות: 2 Kgs 8:7-15), alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of not giving anything to the dead, and thus obeying the voice of Yahweh and doing according to all that he commanded (Deut 26:14).

In the subsequent accounts of the activities of the Judaean kings Jehoram and Ahaziah (2 Kgs 8:16-24.25-29), the ideas of Yahweh as not wanting to destroy Judah because he had promised to give light to David and to his descendants forever (2 Kgs 8:19; cf. 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; diff. 2 Kgs 8:20-22) and of burying Joram in the city of David (2 Kgs 8:24) allude to the Deuteronomic texts concerning Yahweh's faithfulness to Israel (Deut 26:17-19) and concerning the altar of burnt offerings for Yahweh, which should be located in his chosen place (Deut 27:4-7). According to the Judaean author of 2 Kings, this altar was located not at Shechem but in Jerusalem.

4.40 Cursing the unfaithful Israelites and becoming the people of Yahweh (2 Kgs 9-11; cf. Deut 27:8-26)

The combination of the motifs of cursing the unfaithful Israelites and of becoming the people of Yahweh (2 Kgs 9-11) originates from Deut 27:8-26.

In particular, the thought that a faithful Israelite cursed the sinful house of Ahab and Jezebel (2 Kgs 9:7-10; diff. 9:3.12) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of cursing the unfaithful Israelites (Deut 27:15-26).[72] The remark concerning the property of Naboth (2 Kgs 9:21.25-26.36; cf. 1 Kgs 21:1-19) alludes to the Deuteronomic curse on the one who displaces his neighbour's boundary mark (Deut 27:17). The remark concerning Jezebel's fornications and sorceries (2 Kgs

72 The presentation of Jehu as killing Joram king of Israel and Ahaziah king of Judah (2 Kgs 9:14-27) seems to contradict the data of the Tel Dan Inscription ll. 7-8. Cf. H. Hagelia, *The Dan Debate: The Tel Dan Inscription in Recent Research* (RRBS 4; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2009), 114-117.

9:22; cf. 9:30) alludes to the Deuteronomic curses on those who practise idolatry and commit various kinds of fornication (Deut 27:15.20-23). The thought that the sinful Jezebel was explicitly cursed (ארור) by the faithful Israelite Jehu (2 Kgs 9:34) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of cursing the unfaithful Israelites (Deut 27:15-26).

The thought that the Israelites obeyed (שׁמע) the voice (קול) of Yahweh's representative Jehu, that is his written (כתב) command, and did (עשׂה) according to his words (2 Kgs 10:1.5-7; cf. 10:9-10.17.30) illustrates the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should obey Yahweh's voice, that is his written law, and do everything which he commands (Deut 27:8.10; cf. 27:6). The motif of exterminating the worshippers of Baal (2 Kgs 10:18-27; cf. 11:18) alludes to the Deuteronomic curse on those who practise idolatry (Deut 27:15). The somewhat surprisingly introduced idea of following the law (תורה) of Yahweh (2 Kgs 10:31; cf. 10:16)[73] alludes to the idea of preserving the law of Yahweh (Deut 27:8; cf. 27:3.26).

The idea of punishing Athaliah for her perverting the justice which was due to the orphan Joash (2 Kgs 11) alludes to the Deuteronomic curse Deut 27:19. The surprisingly introduced thought that in Yahweh's chosen place Jehoiada the priest (הכהן) made a covenant with the people and commanded (צוה) them to act according to Yahweh's will (2 Kgs 11:4-10.15.17-18)[74] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Moses and the priests commanded the people to enact Yahweh's covenant with them in Yahweh's chosen place (Deut 27:9-13). The idea of the Israelites as doing (עשׂה) according to all that Yahweh's representative commanded (צוה: 2 Kgs 11:9; cf. 11:5) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites being exhorted to do everything which Yahweh commands (Deut 27:10). The motif of the Israelites becoming the people of Yahweh (היה + לעם ליהוה: 2 Kgs 11:17; cf. 9:6; 10:18) was borrowed from Deut 27:9.

---

73 The Assyrian sources present Jehu as subservient to the Assyrians, and not as a champion of his nation's cultural independence: cf. *RIMA* A.0.102.88 [Black Obelisk epigraph 2]; cf. also *RIMA* A.0.102.8 25″-27″ [Calah bulls]; A.0.102.10 iv 10-11 [wall of Aššur stone tablet]; A.0.102.12 29-30 [Kurbail statue]; A.0.102.16 134′-135′ [Calah statue]. Cf. also G. Galil, 'Shalmaneser III in the West', *RB* 109 (2002) 40-56 (esp. 51-53); R. Merecz, 'Assyrian-Israelite Dynamics: On the Circumstances Leading to Jehu's Elevation to the Throne', *RoczT* 54 (2007), fasc. 1, 5-21 (esp. 19-20).

74 Cf. T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings* (WBC 13; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1985), 135.

4.41 Blessings for faithfulness, and curses and exile for unfaithfulness (2 Kgs 12-17; cf. Deut 28)

The combination of the motifs of Yahweh's blessings for Israel's faithfulness and of Yahweh's curses and exile for Israel's unfaithfulness (2 Kgs 12-17) originates from Deut 28.

In particular, the story about the faithful king Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:1-22) functions as an example of Yahweh's blessings for Israel's faithfulness (Deut 28:1-14). The image of Jehoash as caring for holy (קדשׁ) things (2 Kgs 12:5-16) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of Israel as being a holy people (Deut 28:9). The thought that Jehoash protected Jerusalem from its enemies who went up against (על) it (2 Kgs 12:18-19) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh will help in defending Israel from its enemies who rise against it (Deut 28:7; cf. 28:10). The optimistic remarks concerning all the kings of Israel and Judah who are mentioned in the section 2 Kgs 13:1-15:7 (esp. 13:4.17-19.21.23; 14:3.6-7.22.25-27; 15:3; cf. 15:12), remarks which are quite surprising in the generally pessimistic context of that section, also allude to the Deuteronomic motif of Yahweh's blessings for Israel (Deut 28:1-14).

The subsequent section 2 Kgs 15:8-17:41 illustrates the Deuteronomic idea of regarding Yahweh's curses and the exile of the Israelites as Yahweh's punishment for Israel's unfaithfulness (Deut 28:15-68). In particular, the motif of keeping Yahweh's commandments and statutes which Yahweh commanded (שׁמר + מצות + חקות + אשׁר + צוה: 2 Kgs 17:13; cf. 17:15.19.34.37; 18:12) was borrowed from Deut 28:15. Likewise, the motif of the Israelites not listening (לא שׁמע) to Yahweh (2 Kgs 17:14.40; cf. 18:12) was borrowed from Deut 28:15. The motif of Yahweh making (כרת) a covenant (ברית) with (את) the Israelites (2 Kgs 17:15.35.38; cf. 18:12) was borrowed from Deut 28:69. The Judaean author of 2 Kings rhetorically presented both the Israelites as dwelling in Assyria 'to this day' (2 Kgs 17:23) and the land of Israel as inhabited by foreign nations who worship Yahweh in an illegal way 'to this day' (2 Kgs 17:24-41).

4.42 Prospering because of keeping the commandments, Yahweh's sign, serving abominable idols, and being wiped out (2 Kgs 18-21; cf. Deut 29-30)

The combination of the motifs of prospering because of keeping the Mosaic commandments, Yahweh giving a sign, the Israelites serving abominable idols, and being wiped out (2 Kgs 18-21) originates from Deut 29-30.

In particular, the optimistic story about King Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18-20), which was composed with the use of Is 36-39, alludes to the ideas of the likewise optimistic fragment Deut 29:1-14. The thought that Hezekiah kept (שׁמר) the Mosaic commandments (2 Kgs 18:6) alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of the Israelites keeping the words of the Mosaic covenant (Deut 29:8). The subsequent thought that Hezekiah prospered (שׂכל) in all that (כל אשׁר) he set out to do (2 Kgs 18:7) illustrates the related Deuteronomic thought that the one who is faithful to Yahweh will succeed in all that he does (Deut 29:8). Likewise, the redundantly repeated thought that Samaria was taken because the Israelites transgressed the Mosaic covenant (ברית) and did not do (עשׂה) its stipulations (2 Kgs 18:9-12; cf. 17:5-17)[75] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites should do the words of the Mosaic covenant (Deut 29:8; cf. 29:11.13.20.24).

The motif of Yahweh making a sign (אות) for Hezekiah (2 Kgs 19:29; cf. Is 37:30), which is elaborated in a quite surprising way in 2 Kgs 20:5.7-9 (diff. Is 38:5.7.21-22),[76] alludes to the Deuteronomic motif of Yahweh making signs during the Israelites' exodus from Egypt (Deut 29:2). Likewise, the somewhat surprising thought that Yahweh's representative in a miraculous way struck down (נכה) the enemy army and thereafter the enemy king (מלך), who was killed by his two sons (2 Kgs 19:35-37; cf. Is 37:36-38; cf. also Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.141),[77] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Yahweh in a miraculous way

---

75 Cf. ibid. 247; M. A. Sweeney, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (OTL; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2007), 410.

76 Cf. T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings*, 292-293. This fact suggests that 2 Kgs 18-20 is literarily dependent on Is 36-39, and not vice versa.

77 Although there were certainly some reasons for the retreat of the Assyrian army from Judaea (cf. Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.141), the Assyrian sources suggest that Sennacherib's forces simply withdrew to Nineveh: cf. W. Mayer, 'Sennacherib's Campaign of 701 BCE: The Assyrian View', in L. L. Grabbe (ed.), *'Like a Bird in a Cage': The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (JSOTSup 363; Sheffield Academic: London · New York

struck down the Pharaoh's army and thereafter two kings in Transjordan (Deut 29:1-2.6).

The subsequent, pessimistic story about Manasseh and Amon (2 Kgs 21) alludes to the ideas of the likewise pessimistic fragment Deut 29:15-27 (cf. 29:28-30:20). The image of Manasseh as doing abominable practices of the Canaanite nations (הגוים: 2 Kgs 21:2; cf. 21:9) alludes to the Deuteronomic image of the Israelites as coming through the midst of the Canaanite nations and seeing their abominations (Deut 29:15-16). The subsequent thought that Manasseh served (עבד) other gods (2 Kgs 21:3), that is abominable idols (גללים: 2 Kgs 21:11; cf. 21:21), alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites saw the Canaanites' abominable idols and gods, but they should not serve them (Deut 29:16-17). The subsequent motifs of provoking Yahweh to anger and of being chosen from among all the tribes of Israel (מכל שׁבטי ישׂראל: 2 Kgs 21:4-7) were borrowed from Deut 29:18-20. The subsequent, combined idea of the Israelites as being exiled from the land (אדמה) which Yahweh gave (נתן) to their fathers (2 Kgs 21:8) was borrowed from Deut 29:27; 30:20 (cf. 30:18).

The ideas of the Israelites as keeping (שׁמר) and doing (עשׂה) the Mosaic commandments and the Mosaic law (התורה: 2 Kgs 21:8) were borrowed from Deut 30:8.10.12-14.16. The subsequent motif of the Israelites not listening (לא שׁמע) to Yahweh (2 Kgs 21:9) was borrowed from Deut 30:17 (cf. 30:2.8.10.12-13.20).

The motifs of Yahweh bringing evil (רעה) upon sinful Jerusalem and of his wiping (מחה) it out (2 Kgs 21:12-13) were borrowed from Deut 29:19-20. The subsequent motif of the Israelites' ancestors coming out (יצא) of Egypt (מצרים: 2 Kgs 21:15) was borrowed from Deut 29:24. Likewise, the motif of abandoning (עזב) Yahweh (2 Kgs 21:22) was borrowed from Deut 29:24.

2003), 168-200 (esp. 181, 186-200). See L. L. Grabbe, 'Reflections on the Discussion', in id. (ed.), *'Like a Bird in a Cage'*, 308-323 (esp. 309-314); P. Dubovský, 'Assyrian Downfall through Isaiah's Eyes (2 Kings 15-23): The Historiography of Representation', *Bib* 89 (2008) 1-16 (esp. 4-5); P. S. Evans, *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18-19* (VTSup 125; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 181-185.

4.43 Publicly reading the written law, which was received from a priest, and celebrating a feast (2 Kgs 22:1-23:30; cf. Deut 31)

The combination of the motifs of publicly reading the written law, which was received from a priest, and of celebrating a feast (2 Kgs 22:1-23:30) originates from Deut 31.

In particular, the image of the young Josiah as a spiritual heir of David (2 Kgs 22:2-3)[78] alludes to the Deuteronomic image of Joshua as the spiritual heir of Moses (Deut 31:1-3.7.14.23).

The thought that the high priest (הכהן) Hilkiah was active in the temple of Yahweh (2 Kgs 22:4-8) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the priests and the Levites should carry the ark of the covenant of Yahweh (Deut 31:9.25). The well-known literary motif of finding a book,[79] in this case the book of the law (ספר התורה), in the temple (2 Kgs 22:8.10-11; cf. 22:13.16; 23:2-3.21.24-25) illustrates the Deuteronomic idea that the book of the law should be put beside the ark of the covenant (Deut 31:26; cf. 31:9.11-12.24).[80] The thought that the priest (הכהן) was responsible not only for preserving the book of the law (ספר התורה) in the temple but also for making it known to the Israelites (2 Kgs 22:8.10.12-14.20; 23:2.4.24) illustrates the Deuteronomic regulations concerning the priests and the Levites (Deut 31:9-13.25-28).

The descriptions of various people as reading (קרא) the book of the law before the Israelites (2 Kgs 22:10; 23:2; cf. 22:8.16) in a narrative way illustrate

---

78 For a recent critical assessment of the historicity of the so-called Josianic reform, see N. P. Lemche, 'Did a Reform like Josiah's Happen?', in P. R. Davies and D. V. Edelman (eds.), *The Historian and the Bible*, Festschrift L. L. Grabbe (LHBOTS 530; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 11-19 (here: 18): '[…] Josiah's reform is neither mentioned nor alluded to anywhere in the book of Jeremiah, although Jeremiah is supposed to have been an eyewitness, given that he is said to have been called to be a prophet in 626 B.C.E. There are almost no references even to Josiah himself in the book of Jeremiah, let alone to an event that is supposed to have taken place, on the biblical chronology, only three years after Jeremiah's career as a prophet started.'

79 Cf. J. Ben-Dov, 'Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah', *JBL* 127 (2008) 223-239 (esp. 232-234); N. Na'aman, 'The "Discovered Book" and the Legitimation of Josiah's Reform', *JBL* 130 (2011) 47-62 (esp. 49-53).

80 Cf. G. J. Venema, *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9-10; 31 – 2 Kings 22-23 – Jeremiah 36 – Nehemiah 8* (OtSt 48; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2004), 71-75.

the Deuteronomic instruction to read the book of the law before the Israelites (Deut 31:11).[81] The subsequent motif of the Israelites hearing (שׁמע) the words (דברים) of the law (2 Kgs 22:11.13.18-19; cf. 22:16) was borrowed from Deut 31:12-13. Likewise, the motif of hearing (שׁמע) the words (דברים) of the law in order to do (לעשׂות) it (2 Kgs 22:13; cf. 22:2; 23:17.19.21-23) was borrowed from Deut 31:12. The motif of the law of Yahweh as being written (כתב: 2 Kgs 22:13; 23:3.21.24) was borrowed from Deut 31:9.24 (cf. 31:19.22).[82]

The motif of Yahweh bringing evil (רעה) on the Israelites in the future (2 Kgs 22:16.20) was borrowed from Deut 31:17 (cf. 31:18.21.29). The related motif of the Israelites abandoning (עזב) Yahweh (2 Kgs 22:17) was borrowed from Deut 31:16. The subsequent motif of the Israelites worshipping other gods (אלהים אחרים: 2 Kgs 22:17) was borrowed from Deut 31:18.20 (cf. 31:16). The idea of the Israelites as provoking Yahweh with the work of their hands (כעס + ב + מעשׂה + ידים: 2 Kgs 22:17; cf. 23:19.26) was borrowed from Deut 31:29.

The idea of gathering the elders (זקני) of the people, because of their being responsible for letting the people know the law of Yahweh (2 Kgs 23:1), was borrowed from Deut 31:9-12.28. Likewise, the motif of gathering all (כל) the Israelites, that is all the people (העם), both small and great (2 Kgs 23:2), was borrowed from Deut 31:11-13. The subsequent thought that the leader of the people read the law in their hearing (קרא + באזניהם: 2 Kgs 23:2) alludes to the Deuteronomic instruction Deut 31:11.[83]

The narratively superfluous statement that Yahweh's representative stood (עמד) by a pillar (עמוד) in the temple (2 Kgs 23:3) alludes to the Deuteronomic statement that the pillar of cloud stood at the entrance to the tent of meeting (Deut 31:15). The idea of making (כרת) the covenant (ברית) before Yahweh (2 Kgs 23:3) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as making his covenant with the Israelites (Deut 31:16). The motif of the Israelites keeping (שׁמר) and performing the words (דברי) of this (הזאת) book of the law (2 Kgs 23:3) was borrowed from Deut 31:12.

The thought that the Israelites did (עשׂה) idolatrous objects (2 Kgs 23:4.12.15.19) alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that the Israelites will do

---

81 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, vol. 1, *Historical Traditions* (rev. edn., St Vladimir's Seminary: Crestwood, NY 2003), 130.

82 Cf. F. García López, 'Muerte', 93.

83 Cf. ibid. 98; B. M. Levinson, 'The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah', *VT* 51 (2001) 511-534 (esp. 530).

evil things by practising idolatry (Deut 31:18.21.29). The Judaean author of 2 Kings presented the Israelite sanctuary at Bethel as causing idolatry to spread in Israel (2 Kgs 23:4.15-19).

The somewhat strange thought that the king commanded (ויצו) the Israelites to commonly celebrate the Passover, one of the three main festivals of Israel, in the year (שׁנה) of the public reading of the law, so apparently already at the beginning of his far-reaching religious reform (2 Kgs 23:21-23; cf. 22:3),[84] alludes to the Deuteronomic thought that Moses commanded the Israelites to publicly read the law during the commonly celebrated festival of booths in the year of remission (Deut 31:10). The author of 2 Kings, in line with Josh 5:10-11, most probably regarded the spring festival of Passover, rather than the autumn festival of booths, as suitable for marking the beginning of a new era of worshipping Yahweh in the land of Israel. The concluding statement 2 Kgs 23:25 presents Josiah as the king 'like Moses' (cf. Deut 34:10-12; cf. also 18:15.18) and consequently his reform as the 'new covenant', now only with the tribe of Judah.

The somewhat surprisingly introduced motif of Yahweh's kindled anger (חרה אף) against the Israelites (2 Kgs 23:26)[85] was borrowed from Deut 31:17. The motif of Yahweh particularly choosing (בחר) the place of worshipping him (2 Kgs 23:27) was borrowed from Deut 31:11.

4.44 Being exiled, Yahweh's protection for the distanced Judaeans, and dying in the exile (2 Kgs 23:31-25:30; cf. Deut 32-34)

The combination of the motifs of being exiled, Yahweh's protection for the distanced Judaeans, and dying in the exile (2 Kgs 23:31-25:30) originates from Deut 32-34.

In particular, the thought that Jehoahaz was taken away to Egypt and that he died there (וימת שׁם: 2 Kgs 23:34) alludes to the Deuteronomic idea that the Israelites with their leader Moses were taken into exile and died there (Deut 34:5;

---

84 Cf. J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman (ed.), *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1951), 535-536; L. S. Monroe, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (Oxford University: Oxford [et al.] 2011), 15-16.

85 Cf. T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings*, 338.

cf. 32:39.50). The idea of the exile of the Israelites as in fact caused by Yahweh's anger (אף: 2 Kgs 24:20) was borrowed from Deut 32:22.

The surprising thought that the Judaean king was raised above all other kings (2 Kgs 25:28)[86] alludes to the expectations concerning the Judaean royal rule, which should last and extend over other peoples (Gen 49:10 etc.).[87] The statement concerning Jehoiachin as released from prison and eating before the king (2 Kgs 25:29) may allude to the Deuteronomic idea of Yahweh as helping the distanced Judaeans against their enemies (Deut 33:7). The concluding, somewhat ambiguous statements which suggest that the Jewish king spent the rest of his days in the exile, far away from the land of Israel, in quite good conditions (2 Kgs 25:29-30; diff. 25:7)[88] probably allude to the Deuteronomic image of Moses as dying in the exile, east of the land of Canaan, with his vigour undiminished (Deut 34:5-7; cf. 32:49-52; 34:1-4).

4.45 Conclusions

The set of the books of Samuel and Kings in a consistent, sequential way adapts the ideas and literary motifs of the Israelite book of Deuteronomy to the needs of the Judaean audience. The author of Samuel-Kings evidently adopted the procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of an earlier literary work, which was already earlier used in Deuteronomy, Genesis, and Exodus-Numbers, to his new literary work.

The books of Samuel and Kings were written at the beginning of the Hellenistic period,[89] presumably *c.*300 BC (cf. esp. 1 Sam 17:7 with its image of a

---

86 Cf. B. Becking, 'Jehoiachin's Amnesty, Salvation for Israel? Notes on 2 Kings 25:27-30', in id., *From David to Gedaliah: The Book of Kings as Story and History* (OBO 228; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2007), 174-189 (esp. 176-177); J. E. Harvey, 'Jehoiachin and Joseph: Hope at the Close of the Deuteronomistic History', in R. Heskett and B. Irwin (eds.), *The Bible as a Human Witness to Divine Revelation: Hearing the Word of God Through Historically Dissimilar Traditions* (LHBOTS 469; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 51-61 (esp. 54).

87 For possible references of 2 Kgs 25:28-30 to Is 52:13-53:12 see M. Goulder, '"Behold My Servant Jehoiachin"', *VT* 52 (2002) 175-190.

88 Cf. S. Frolov, 'Evil-Merodach and the Deuteronomist: The Sociohistorical Setting of Dtr in the Light of 2 Kgs 25,27-30', *Bib* 88 (2007) 174-190 (esp. 185).

89 Cf. K.-P. Adam, 'Nocturnal Intrusions and Divine Interventions on Behalf of Judah: David's Wisdom and Saul's Tragedy in 1 Samuel 26', *VT* 59 (2009) 1-33 (esp. 33); id.,

Hellenistic sarissa). However, they refer to the distant past, to the history of the pre-exilic Judaea. The Judaean author of Samuel-Kings resolved to supplement the Israelite para-historical Heptateuch (Gen-Judg),[90] whose story began with the creation of the world (Gen 1:1) and ended in the transitory sanctuary at Shiloh (Judg 21:12-23; cf. 18:31), which was somewhat symbolically located between the old sanctuary at Bethel and the new sanctuary at Shechem (Judg 21:19), with a literary history of Judaea, which began in the transitory sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Sam 1:3) and ended in the Babylonian exile (2 Kgs 25:30), likewise with a hope for a better future (2 Kgs 25:28).

In the composition of his literary work, the author of Samuel-Kings used not only the book of Deuteronomy and the whole Israelite Heptateuch (Gen-Judg), but also the works of several prophets, especially the Judaean prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah. He evidently also used some Israelite and Judaean chronicles as a historical basis for his rhetorical-theological narrative (cf. e.g. 2 Kgs 3:4-5; 20:20; 23:28-29).[91]

In his adaptation of the ideas of Deuteronomy to the literary history of Judaea, the author of Samuel-Kings presented Judaea as the legitimate heir of the Israelite theological traditions. In particular, with the use of the Deuter-

---

'1 Sam 28: A Comment on Saul's Destiny from a Late Prophetic Point of View', *RB* 116 (2009) 27-43; id., 'Saul as a Tragic Hero: Greek Drama and Its Influence on Hebrew Scripture in 1 Samuel 14,24-46 (10,8; 13,7-13a; 10,17-27)', in A. G. Auld and E. Eynikel (eds.), *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel* (BETL 232; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2010), 123-183 (esp. 167), who suggests that the books of Samuel were composed in the first half of the third century BC. Cf. also J. Van Seters, *Saga*, 360: 'late Persian and early Hellenistic'.

90 For the idea that Gen-Judg presents a distinctively Israelite point of view, cf. Y. Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2, *A Temple City* (JSP 8; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2008), 171-172. The number seven as the number of the books in this Israelite proto-canon probably had a symbolic function. Moreover, this Israelite proto-canon, with its particular conclusion concerning kings in Israel (Judg 21:25), could function as an elaborate 'proto-historical' prologue to the chronicles of the kings of Israel (1 Kgs 14:19-20 etc.).

91 For a possible reconstruction of such chronicles, see L. L. Grabbe, 'Mighty Oaks from (Genetically Manipulated?) Acorns Grow: *The Chronicle of the Kings of Judah* as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History', in R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker (eds.), *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography*, Festschrift A. G. Auld (VTSup 113; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007), 155-173 (esp. 162-168). The correctness of the basic historical data of Samuel-Kings implies that its author must have used some sources of this type.

onomic idea of the succession to the old, sinful generation of the Israelites, with their leader Moses, in the new, innocent generation of the Israelites, with their leader Joshua (Deut 2:14-18; 3:21-28; 31:14.22-23; 34:5-9), the author of Samuel-Kings rhetorically presented the political-religious idea of the transfer of Yahweh's choice and grace from the Israelite tribe of Ephraim, with its divinely cursed sanctuaries at Shiloh (1 Sam 1-4) and Bethel (2 Kgs 2:23-25; 23:4.15-19), its sinful sanctuary at Shechem (1 Kgs 12:1-25; diff. Deut 11:29-12:31; 27:4-7), and its half-Gentile population (2 Sam 24:7; 2 Kgs 17:23-41), through the Gentile territory of the Philistines (1 Sam 5) to the tribe of Judah, with its divinely blessed sanctuary in Jerusalem (1 Sam 6; 2 Sam 6; 24:16-25; 1 Kgs 5-9) and its divinely blessed land (2 Kgs 2:19-22).[92] In this respect, the books of Samuel and Kings resemble the book of Ruth, with its narrative justification of the transfer of Yahweh's grace from the 'terminally ill' tribe of Ephraim (Ruth 1:2-3.5) through the 'refreshing' territory of Moab (Ruth 1:4-22) to the 'mighty' tribe of Judah (Ruth 2-4).[93]

In fact, the books of Samuel and Kings narratively suggest that the major prophetic and Deuteronomic traditions were (and should be) fulfilled in the Jerusalem temple and in the house of David. For this reason, this Judaean para-historical work, like earlier the book of Deuteronomy, may be regarded as another, this time distinctively Jewish, narrative 'New Testament' (cf. esp. 2 Kgs 23:2-3.25) in the Old Testament.

In his sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, the author of Samuel-Kings not only adopted but also reformulated various Deuteronomic theological ideas. In particular, in addition to his main political-religious idea of the transfer of Yahweh's grace from Israel to Judaea, the author of Samuel-Kings stressed the role of the king as the anointed one, and consequently as

---

92 Cf. J. Van Seters, *Saga*, 346-348. Cf. also D. Edelman, 'Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple', in F. Stavrakopoulou and J. Barton (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 82-103 (esp. 84-85).

93 Since the book of Ruth resulted from a creative reworking of various motifs which were borrowed from the Israelite Heptateuch (Gen-Judg), and since it still presents the fields of Moab as the intermediate location in the transfer of Yahweh's grace from the 'old' tribe of Ephraim to the 'young' tribe of Judah (cf. Deut 34:1-8 etc.), it is reasonable to suppose that it functioned as an ideological model for the later, in fact anti-Hellenistic story about of the transfer of the ark of Yahweh from the tribe of Ephraim through the territory of the Greek-like Philistines to the tribe of Judah (1 Sam 1 – 1 Kgs 9).

performing not only royal (e.g. 2 Sam 4:9-12 diff. Deut 9:25-29) but also some priestly functions (e.g. 2 Sam 6 diff. Deut 10:1-11; 1 Kgs 3:16-28 diff. Deut 17:8-12).[94] Moreover, the author of Samuel-Kings presented the character of David as partly embodying the features of the invisible Yahweh (cf. e.g. 2 Sam 9:1.3.7.9-10; 10:1-4.13-14.18-19 and Deut 10:18). Likewise, the author of Samuel-Kings reworked the Deuteronomic idea of prolonging one's life by means of raising up a son, and thus preserving one's name in Israel (Deut 25:5-6; cf. 2 Kgs 4:8-17), into that of reviving a person from the physical death (2 Kgs 4:32-37). In this way, the author of Samuel-Kings provided a theological background to the New Testament Christology.

---

94 Cf. R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 331-333, 342, 474; B. M. Levinson, 'Reconceptualization', 527-529.

General conclusions

The analysis of the use of the procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier writings in the Pentateuch and in the so-called historical books of the Old Testament has revealed that the history of their composition was relatively simple.

At the beginning of the postexilic period, probably *c.*500 BC, the Israelite author of Deuteronomy in a sequential hypertextual way reworked the contents of the work of the Judaean prophet Ezekiel, in order to adapt his vision of a new, united, and purified Israel, which should have only one temple of Yahweh, to the prophetic idea of a new covenant of Yahweh with the Israelites and to the likewise restorative, strictly monotheistic vision of Deutero-Isaiah. The author of Deuteronomy substituted Ezekiel's visionary, prophetic figure of the 'son of man' with the narrative, likewise prophetic character of Moses, that is one 'born', as the leader who should implement a great religious reform and bring the Israelites back to their land.

A century later, probably *c.*400 BC, after the composition of the Israelite book of Joshua and probably also after the composition of the likewise Israelite book of Judges, the Israelite author of Genesis in a sequential hypertextual way reworked the contents of Deuteronomy, in order to present its ideas in the form of a widely understandable, para-historical narrative, which refers to humankind and Israel's prehistory. Probably roughly at the same time, the likewise Israelite author of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers composed this set of writings as another sequential hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy, this time functioning as an extended, narrative introduction to Deuteronomy, an introduction which systematically clarified and reformulated its ideas. In this way, the great Israelite para-historical Heptateuch (Gen-Judg), whose story began with the creation of the world and ended in the transitory sanctuary at Shiloh, which was somewhat symbolically located between the old sanctuary at Bethel and the new sanctuary at Shechem, came into being and could be regarded as the narrative-rhetorical foundation of the religion of the postexilic Israel.

Still later, probably *c.*300 BC, the Judaean author of the books of Samuel and Kings in a sequential hypertextual way once more reworked the contents of Deuteronomy, in order to compose a great foundational history of Judaea, which could follow and supplement the story of the Israelite Heptateuch (Gen-Judg). In his reworking of Deuteronomy, the author of Samuel-Kings, probably developing the main idea of the book of Ruth, presented Judaea with its Davidic dynasty

and its Jerusalem temple of Yahweh as the only true, legitimate heir of the Israelite theological traditions. Somewhat later, the likewise Judaean author of the books of Chronicles combined the Israelite and the Judaean para-historical narratives in order to compose one, continuous story of humankind, Israel, and Judaea before the Persian era.

The recognition of these facts leads to several important conclusions.

1. The above-presented analyses disprove the theories of the existence of the so-called 'sources' or 'traditions' of the Pentateuch (J, E, D, P, etc.). The authors of these theories failed to discover and recognize the fact that narrative inconsistencies and repetitions in biblical writings generally resulted not from a mechanical combination of fragments of some hypothetical sources or traditions but from a creative sequential reworking of thematically variegated hypotexts. These hypotexts decisively shaped not only general meaning but also particular literary features of the hypertexts, which are for this reason not always narratively consistent.

2. The distinction between the so-called Deuteronomic (or non-priestly) and priestly ideas in the Pentateuch, which initially hermeneutically reflected the difference between pious listening to God's word and various forms of institutional cultus, should be largely abandoned. The priestly origin and numerous priestly features of the Deuteronomic theology on the one hand and overwhelming Deuteronomic influence on later biblical writings on the other reveal that such a distinction is too simplistic, if not purely artificial.

3. The level of thematic and linguistic correspondence between the structurally matching fragments of the biblical hypertexts and their sequentially reworked hypotexts is generally much higher than that which functions as the basis for postulating the presence of concentric and chiastic structures in the Old Testament writings. It seems therefore that, from the methodological point of view, the scholarly fashion for tracing concentric structures in biblical writings has more to do with twentieth-century structuralism (which suggests that the text is a semantically closed structure) than with the ways in which ancient authors imitated and emulated earlier, especially highly authoritative texts.

4. The Pentateuch and the so-called historical books of the Old Testament were not composed in order to preserve history but in order to create history. They constitute imaginative, rhetorically powerful, divinely inspired visions of human reality, as it is perceived from a divine, theological perspective and, on the other hand, from a distinctively Israelite or Judaean point of view. Therefore, looking for 'real history' in the Pentateuch or in the story of Samuel, Saul,

David, and Solomon does not do justice to the literary-intertextual features and the rhetorical aims of these writings.

5. Numerous Old Testament writings are based on the prophetic idea of Yahweh's new covenant with his people. This idea was mainly developed in order to resolve the problem of Israel's and Judaea's sin. A new, innocent generation was hoped to replace the old, corrupt one, which had to die because of its sins. In fact, the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Genesis-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings (cf. also the Damascus Document etc.) constitute variegated, narrative-legal 'new covenants', which are enacted in Israel and later in Judaea in rhetorical, para-historical ways. The recognition of the fact that there are several 'New Testaments' in the Old Testament may constitute an important bridge between the basic theological ideas of Judaism and Christianity.

6. The Pentateuch is not a Jewish work, at least in the sense that it was not written by the Jews. As a whole, it originates from Israel and it presents a distinctively Israelite reworking of the Israelite book of Deuteronomy. Only later was the Pentateuch adopted by the Jews as the most important part of their canon of the sacred Scriptures. In this respect, the Jews, somewhat similarly to the Christians, are only secondary heirs and custodians of this great foundational-constitutional vision of an ideal Israel. For this reason, modern Jews, like modern Christians, do not have to feel obliged by the Torah to take possession of the so-called West Bank, which constitutes the main part of the territory of the historical Israel.

7. The four later books of the Pentateuch, that is Genesis and Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers, almost completely deconstruct the ideology of holy war, which is witnessed in the earlier book of Deuteronomy. The major and theologically more developed part of the divinely inspired Pentateuch shows how a peaceful life of believing Israelites with righteous non-Israelites in Canaan may be possible. This fact may have great consequences for overcoming the ideology of holy war in the present conflict over the land in Israel, and consequently in the conflict between the great monotheistic civilizations in our world.

Bibliography

Primary sources

General

Hallo, W. W. and Younger, Jr., K. L. (eds.), The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World, vol. 1-3 (Brill: Leiden · New York · Köln 1997-2002).

Mesopotamian

The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford), updated 19 Dec. 2006 <http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed 21 Sept. 2011.

George, A. R., *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*, vol. 1-2 (Oxford University: Oxford 2003).

George, A. R., *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumeriology 10; Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Cuneiform Texts 4; CDL: Bethesda, Md. 2009), 16-41 [fragments of *Atram-ḫasīs* and *Gilgameš Epic*].

Grayson, A. K., *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC*, vol. 2, *858-745 BC* (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Assyrian Periods 3; University of Toronto: Toronto · Buffalo · London 1996) [*RIMA*].

Izre'el, S., *Adapa and the South Wind: Language Has the Power of Life and Death* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 10; Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2001).

Lambert, W. G. and Millard, A. R., *Babylonian Literary Texts* (Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum 46; Trustees of the British Museum: London 1965) [no. 43: the so-called *Theogony of Dunnu*].

Lambert, W. G., Millard, A. R., and Civil, M., *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood, with the Sumerian Flood Story* [here as *Eridu Genesis*] (Clarendon: Oxford 1969).

Schøyen MS 2063 (to be published, Schøyen Collection: 2.2. Babylonian History) <http://schoyencollection.com/historyBabylonian.html>, accessed 21 Sept. 2011 [The Tower of Babel Stele].

Talon, P., *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth: Enūma Eliš: Introduction, Cuneiform Text, Transliteration, and Sign List with a Translation and Glossary in French* (State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 4; Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project: Helsinki 2005).

Viel, H.-D., *The Complete Code of Hammurabi*, vol. 1-2 (Lincom Europa: München 2005).

Westenholz, J. G., *Legends of the Kings of Akkade: The Texts* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 7; Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 1997), 36-49 [The 'Birth Legend' of Sargon].

West Semitic

Donner, H. and Röllig, W., *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, vol. 1-3 (5th edn., Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 1976-2002).

Hagelia, H., *The Tel Dan Inscription: A Critical Investigation of Recent Research on Its Paleography and Philology* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 22; Uppsala Universitet: [s.l.] 2006).

Greek

Euripides, *Hippolytus*, ed. W. Stockert (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; B. G. Teubner: Stutgardiae · Lipsiae 1994).

Euripides, *Iphigenie in Aulis*, ed. W. Stockert, vol. 1-2 (Wiener Studien: Beiheft 16/1-2; Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Wien 1992).

Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. H. B. Rosén, vol. 1-2 (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Teubner: Stutgardiae · Lipsiae 1987-1997).

Israelite–Jewish

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph [et al.] (5th edn., Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart 1997).

The Pentateuch: The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Text, ed. A. Tal and M. Florentin (Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University: Tel Aviv 2010).

Septuaginta: Editio altera, ed. A. Rahlfs and R. Hanhart (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart 2006).

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graece: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, ed. A. Rahlfs and J. Ziegler [et al.], vol. 1-16 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 1931-).

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, ed. D. Barthélemy [et al.], vol. 1-40 (Clarendon: Oxford 1955-2011).

Secondary literature

Achenbach, R., 'Die Erzählung von der gescheiterten Landnahme von Kadesch Barnea (Numeri 13-14) als Schlüsseltext der Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuchs', *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 9 (2003) 56-123.

Achenbach, R., 'Das Heiligkeitsgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuchredaktion', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 145-175.

Achenbach, R., 'Die Tora und die Propheten im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.', in R. Achenbach, M. Arneth, and E. Otto, *Tora in der Hebräischen Bibel: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte und synchronen Logik diachronen Transformationen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 7; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2007), 26-71.

Adam, K.-P., '1 Sam 28: A Comment on Saul's Destiny from a Late Prophetic Point of View', *Revue biblique* 116 (2009) 27-43.

Adam, K.-P., 'Nocturnal Intrusions and Divine Interventions on Behalf of Judah: David's Wisdom and Saul's Tragedy in 1 Samuel 26', *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009) 1-33.

Adam, K.-P., 'Saul as a Tragic Hero: Greek Drama and Its Influence on Hebrew Scripture in 1 Samuel 14,24-46 (10,8; 13,7-13a; 10,17-27)', in A. G. Auld and E. Eynikel (eds.), *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 232; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2010), 123-183.

Adamczewski, B., *Constructing Relationships, Constructing Faces: Hypertextuality and Ethopoeia in the New Testament Writings* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011).

Adamczewski, B., *The Gospel of the Narrative 'We': The Hypertextual Relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010).

Adamczewski, B., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010).

Adamczewski, B., 'Hypertextuality in the Bible: The Case of Genesis and Deuteronomy', *Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 10 (2011), no. 1 (19) (in press).

Adamczewski, B., '"Kim ja jestem?" (Wj 3,11) – Mojżesza droga do patriotyzmu', *Roczniki Teologiczne Warszawsko-Praskie* 4 (2004-2008) 19-36.

Adamczewski, B., *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010).

Agyenta, A., 'When Reconciliation Means More than the "Re-Membering" of Former Enemies: The Problem of the Conclusion to the Jacob-Esau Story from a Narrative Perspective (Gen 33,1-17)', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 83 (2007) 123-133.

Albertz, R., 'Das Buch Numeri jenseits der Quellentheorie: Eine Redaktionsgeschichte von Num 20-24 (Teil I)', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 123 (2011) 171-183.

Albertz, R., 'From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 53-69.

Alexander, T. D., 'The Regal Dimensions of the תולדות־יעקב: Recovering the Literary Context of Genesis 37-50', in J. G. McConville and K. Möller (eds.), *Reading the Law*, Festschrift G. J. Wenham (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 461; T&T Clark: New York · London 2007), 196-212.

Alonso-Schökel, L., 'Motivos sapienciales y de alianza en Gn 2-3', *Biblica* 43 (1962) 295-315.

Amit, Y., 'Epoch and Genre: The Sixth Century and the Growth of Hidden Polemics', in O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans*

in the Neo-Babylonian Period (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2003), 135-151.

Amit, Y., *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, trans. J. Chipman (Biblical Interpretation Series 25; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2000).

Anderson, A. A., *2 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary 11; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1989).

Arnold, B. T., *Genesis* (New Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2009).

Arnold, B. T., 'Necromancy and Cleromancy in 1 and 2 Samuel', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004) 199-213.

Artus, O., 'The Literary Tensions and Conflicts of Identity in the "Story of Joseph" (Gen 37:2-50:26)', *Indian Theological Studies* 46 (2009) no. 4, 73-90.

Auld, G., 'Samuel, Numbers and the Yahwist-Question', in J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte (eds.), *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngeren Diskussion* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2002), 233-246 [also in id., *Samuel at the Threshold* (Society for Old Testament Study Monographs; Ashgate: Hants · Burlington, Vt. 2004), 243-254].

Avioz, M., 'The Role and Significance of Jebus in Judges 19', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 51 (2007) 249-256.

Bar-Efrat, S., *Das Erste Buch Samuel: Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar*, trans. J. Klein (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 176; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2007).

Bar-Efrat, S., *Das Zweite Buch Samuel: Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar*, trans. J. Klein (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 181; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2009).

Baumgart, N. C., *Die Umkehr des Schöpfergottes: Zu Komposition und religionsgeschichtlichem Hintergrund von Gen 5-9* (Herders biblische Studien 22; Herder: Freiburg [et al.] 1999).

Becker, U., 'Jakob in Bet-El und Sichem', in A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition*, Festschrift M. Köckert (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 400; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 159-185.

Becking, B., 'Jehoiachin's Amnesty, Salvation for Israel? Notes on 2 Kings 25:27-30', in id., *From David to Gedaliah: The Book of Kings as Story*

and History (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 228; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2007), 174-189.

Bellinger, Jr., W. H., *Leviticus and Numbers* (New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 3; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2001).

Ben-Dov, J., 'Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008) 223-239.

Bergen, R. D., *1, 2 Samuel* (New American Commentary 7; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 1996).

Bernat, D. A., *Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in the Priestly Tradition* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 3; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta 2009).

Berner, C., *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010).

Blenkinsopp, J., 'Benjamin Traditions Read in the Early Persian Period', in O. Lipschits and M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2006), 629-645.

Blenkinsopp, J., 'Biographical Patterns in Biblical Narrative: Folklore and Paradigm in the Jacob Story', in id., *Treasures Old and New: Essays in the Theology of the Pentateuch* (William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 2004), 137-154.

Blum, E., *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984).

Boase, E., 'Life in the Shadows: The Role and Function of Isaac in Genesis—Synchronic and Diachronic Readings', *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001) 312-335.

Bodner, K., *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 19; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2008).

Bosworth, D., '"David Comforted Bathsheba" (2 Sam 12:24): Gender and Parental Bereavement', in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke: Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 249; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2011), 238-255.

Braulik, G., 'Ezechiel und Deuteronomium: Die "Sippenhaftung" in Ezechiel 18,20 und Deuteronomium 24,16, unter Berücksichtigung von Jeremia

31,29-30 und 2 Könige 14,6', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 44 (2000) 206-232 [also in id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und seiner Nachgeschichte* (Stuttgarter biblische Ausatzbände 33; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2001), 171-201].

Bremmer, J. N., 'Sacrificing a Child in Ancient Greece: The Case of Iphigeneia', in E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 4; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2002), 21-43.

Brett, M. G., *Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity* (Old Testament Readings; Routledge: London · New York 2000).

Brichto, H. C., *The Names of God: Poetic Readings in Biblical Beginnings* (Oxford University: New York · Oxford 1998).

Briffard, C., 'Moïse *versus* Sargon', *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010) 479-482.

Brodie, T. L., *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary* (Oxford University: New York [et al] 2001).

Bruckner, J. K., *Exodus* (New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 2; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Bletchley [et al.] 2008).

Budd, P. J., *Numbers* (Word Biblical Commentary 5; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1984).

Butler, T. C., *Joshua* (Word Biblical Commentary 7; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1983).

Butler, T. C., *Judges* (Word Biblical Commentary 8; Thomas Nelson: Nashville [et al.] 2009).

Carmichael, C., 'David at the Nob Sanctuary', in A. G. Auld and E. Eynikel (eds.), *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 232; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2010), 201-212.

Carmichael, C., *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in the Light of Biblical Narratives* (The John Hopkins University: Baltimore, Md. 2006).

Carmichael, C. M., 'Joseph, Moses, and the Institution of the Israelite Judicature', in J. E. Coleson and V. H. Matthews (eds.), *"Go to the Land I Will Show You"*, Festschrift D. W. Young (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 1996), 15-25.

Carmichael, C. M., *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1985).

Carmichael, C. M., *The Laws of Deuteronomy* (Cornell University: Ithaka, NY · London 1974).

Carmichael, C., 'The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual', *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000) 167-182.

Carmichael, C., 'The Sabbatical/Jubilee Cycle and the Seven-Year Famine in Egypt', *Biblica* 80 (1999) 224-239.

Carmichael, C., *The Spirit of Biblical Law* (University of Georgia: Athens, Ga. · London 1996).

Carmichael, C., 'The Three Laws on the Release of Slaves (Ex 21,2-11; Dtn 15,12-18; Lev 25,39-46)', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000) 509-525.

Carmichael, C. M., *Women, Law, and the Genesis Traditions* (Edinburgh University: Edinburgh 1979).

Carr, D. M., *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Westminster John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1996).

Charlesworth, J. H., 'An Unknown Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy' (Institute for Judaism and Christian Origins), updated Nov. 2009 <http://www.ijco.org/?categoryId=28682>, accessed 21 Sept. 2011.

Choi, J. H., *Traditions at Odds: The Reception of the Pentateuch in Biblical and Second Temple Literature* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 518; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010).

Cholewiński, A., 'Zur theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes', *Biblica* 66 (1985) 96-111.

Christensen, D. L., *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* (Word Biblical Commentary 6A; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2001).

Christensen, D. L., *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (Word Biblical Commentary 6B; Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2002).

Chrostowski, W., 'Anatomia pokusy (Rdz 3,1-6)', *Przegląd powszechny* 101 (1984) vol. 243, 198-207.

Chrostowski, W., *Ogród Eden: Zapoznane świadectwo asyryjskiej diaspory* (Rozprawy i Studia Biblijne 1; Vocatio: Warszawa 1996).

Chung, I.-S., *A Revisionist Reading of the Esau-Jacob Stories in Genesis 25-36: Understanding Esau in a Positive Light* (Edwin Mellen: Lewinston · Queenston · Lampeter 2011).

Chung, Y. H., *The Sin of the Calf: The Rise of the Bible's Negative Attitude Toward the Golden Calf* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 523; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010).

Clifford, R. J., 'Genesis 38: Its Contribution to the Jacob Story', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004) 519-532.

Coats, G. W., *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (Forms of the Old Testament Literature 1; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1983).

Cole, R. D., *Numbers* (New American Commentary 3B; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2000).

Craigie, P. C., Kelley, P. H., and Drinkard, Jr., J. F., *Jeremiah 1-25* (Word Biblical Commentary 26; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1991).

Crouch, C. L., 'Genesis 1:26-7 as a Statement of Humanity's Divine Parentage', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 61 (2010) 1-15.

Dafni, E. G., *Genesis, Plato und Euripides: Drei Studien zum Austausch von griechischem und hebräischem Sprach- und Gedankengut in der Klassik und im Hellenismus* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 108; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010).

Davidson, R. M., *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. 2007).

Day, J., 'Cain and the Kenites', in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 335-346.

Deijl, A. van der, *Protest or Propaganda: War in the Old Testament Book of Kings and in Contemporaneous Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 51; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2008).

DeVries, S. J., *1 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 12; rev. edn., Thomas Nelson: Nashville 2003).

Dieckmann, D., 'Gen 26 als Segenserzählung', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 49 (2005) 264-274.

Dietrich, W., *Samuel*, vol. 1, *1 Sam 1-12* (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 8/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010).

Döhling, J.-D., 'Die Herrschaft erträumen, die Träume beherrschen: Herrschaft, Traum und Wirklichkeit in den Josefsträumen (Gen 37,5-11) und der Israel-Josefsgeschichte', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 50 (2006) 1-30.

Dohmen, C., ‘Untergang oder Rettung der Quellenscheidung? Die Sintfluterzählung als Prüfstein der Pentateuchexegese’, in A. Wénin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 155; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven [et al.] 2001), 81-104.

Dozeman, T. B., *Commentary on Exodus* (Eerdmans Critical Commentary; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2009).

Dubovský, P., ‘Assyrian Downfall through Isaiah’s Eyes (2 Kings 15-23): The Historiography of Representation’, *Biblica* 89 (2008) 1-16.

Durham, J. I., *Exodus* (Word Biblical Commentary 3; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1987).

Dziadosz, D., *Gli oracoli divini in 1 Sam 8 – 2 Re 25: Redazione e teologia nella storia deuteronomistica dei re* (Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej: Przemyśl 2002).

Dziadosz, D., *Tak było na początku… Izrael opowiada swoje dzieje: Literacka i teologiczna analiza wiodących tradycji Księgi Rodzaju* (Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Przemyskiej: Przemyśl 2011).

Ebach, J., *Genesis 37-50* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament; Herder: Freiburg · Basel · Wien 2007).

Edelman, D., ‘Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple’, in F. Stavrakopoulou and J. Barton (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 82-103.

Emerton, J. A., ‘The Value of the Moabite Stone as an Historical Source’, *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002) 483-492.

Evans, M. J., *1 and 2 Samuel* (New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 6; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2000).

Evans, P. S., *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18-19* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 125; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 181-185.

Finkelstein, I., ‘Philistines in the Bible: A Late-Monarchic Perspective’, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27.2 (2002) 131-167.

Finkelstein, I., ‘The Territorial Extent and Demography of Yehud/Judea in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods’, *Revue biblique* 117 (2010) 39-54.

Fischer, A. A., ‘Beutezug und Segensgabe: Zur Redaktionsgeschichte der Liste in 1 Sam. xxx 26-31’, *Vetus Testamentum* 53 (2003) 48-64.

Fischer, A. A., ‘Michal im Fenster der Redaktion (2 Sam 6,14.16.20-23)’, in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke: Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 249; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2011), 194-208.

Fischer, G., ‘„… nach unserem Bild und unserer Ähnlichkeit” (Gen 1,26): Die provokante Aussage von der Erschaffung des Menschen im Horizont von Altem Testament und Altem Orient’, in H. Schmidinger and C. Sedmak (eds.), *Der Mensch – ein Abbild Gottes? Geschöpf – Krone der Schöpfung – Mitschöpfer* (Typologien des Menschlichen 7; Wissenschaftliche: Darmstadt 2010), 153-175 [also in id., *Die Anfänge der Bibel: Studien zu Genesis und Exodus* (Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände 49; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2011), 14-36].

Fishbane, M., ‘Types of Biblical Intertextuality’, in A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø (eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2000), 39-44.

Flury-Schölch, A., *Abrahams Segen und die Völker: Synchrone und diachrone Untersuchungen zu Gen 12,1-3 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der intertextuellen Beziehungen zu Gen 18; 22; 26; 28; Sir 44; Jer 4 und Ps 72* (Forschung zur Bibel 115; Echter: Würzburg 2007).

Fox, M. V., ‘Wisdom in the Joseph Story’, *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001) 26-41.

Frevel, C., ‘“Jetzt habe ich erkannt, dass YHWH größer ist als alle Götter”: Ex 18 und seine kompositionsgeschichtliche Stellung im Pentateuch’, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 47 (2003) 3-22.

Frolov, S., ‘Evil-Merodach and the Deuteronomist: The Sociohistorical Setting of Dtr in the Light of 2 Kgs 25,27-30’, *Biblica* 88 (2007) 174-190.

Fung, Y.-W., *Victim and Victimizer: Joseph’s Interpretation of his Destiny* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 308; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 2000).

Galil, G., ‘Shalmaneser III in the West’, *Revue biblique* 109 (2002) 40-56.

Galvagno, G., *Sulle vestigia di Giacobbe: Le riletture sacerdotali e post-sacerdotali dell’itinerario del patriarca* (Analecta Biblica 178; Gregorian & Biblical: Roma 2009).

García López, F., ‘La muerte de Moisés, la sucesión de Josué y la escritura de la Tôrah (Deuteronomio 31-34)’, in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 85-99.

Gardner, A. E., ‘The Identity of Bath-sheba’, *Revue biblique* 112 (2005) 521-535.
Garsiel, M., ‘The Valley of Elah Battle and the Duel of David with Goliath: Between History and Artistic Theological Historiography’, in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 391-426.
Gass, E., ‘Topographical Considerations and Redaction Criticism in 2 Kings 3’, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 (2009) 65-84.
Geiger, M., *Gottesräume: Die literarische und theologische Konzeption von Raum im Deuteronomium* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 176; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2010).
Genette, G., *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Seuil: [*s.l.*] 1982).
Gerhards, M., *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose: Literatur- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Schlüsseltext des nichtpriesterlichen Tetrateuch* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 109; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2006), 149-249.
Giuntoli, F., *L’officina della tradizione: Studio di alcuni interventi redazionali post-sacerdotali e del loro contesto nel ciclo di Giacobbe (Gn 25,19 – 50,26)* (Analecta Biblica 154; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2003).
Gmirkin, R. E., *Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentatuech* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 433; T&T Clark: New York · London 2006).
Gnuse, R., ‘From Prison to Prestige: The Hero Who Helps a King in Jewish and Greek Literature’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010) 31-45.
Görg, M., ‘Mose – Name und Namensträger: Versuch einer historischen Annäherung’, in E. Otto (ed.), *Mose: Ägypten und das Alte Testament* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 189; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2000), 17-42.
Goulder, M., ‘“Behold My Servant Jehoiachin”’, *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002) 175-190.
Grabbe, L. L., ‘Mighty Oaks from (Genetically Manipulated?) Acorns Grow: *The Chronicle of the Kings of Judah* as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History’, in R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker (eds.), *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography*, Festschrift A. G. Auld (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 113; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007), 155-173.

Grabbe, L. L., 'Reflections on the Discussion', in id. (ed.), *'Like a Bird in a Cage': The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 363; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2003), 308-323.

Granerød, G., *Abraham and Melchizedek: Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 406; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2010).

Grund, A., *Die Entstehung des Sabbats: Seine Bedeutung für Israels Zeitkonzept und Erinnerungskultur* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 75; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2011).

Hagedorn, A. C., 'Hausmann und Jäger (Gen 25,27-28): Aus den Jugendtagen Jakobs und Esaus', in A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition*, Festschrift M. Köckert (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 400; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 137-157.

Hagelia, H., *The Dan Debate: The Tel Dan Inscription in Recent Research* (Recent Research in Biblical Studies 4; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2009).

Halpern, B., 'Archaeology, the Bible and History: The Fall of the House of Omri—and the Origins of the Israelite State', in T. E. Levy (ed.), *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* (Equinox: London · Oakville 2010), 262-284.

Hamilton, V. P., *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1990).

Hamilton, V. P., *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 1995).

Hartley, J. E., *Genesis* (New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 1; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. and Paternoster: Carlisle 2000).

Hartley, J. E., *Leviticus* (Word Biblical Commentary 4; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1992).

Hartmann, T. A. G., 'Mose und Maria – »Amuns Kind und Liebling« – Auf den ägyptischen Spuren zweier Biblischen Namen', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004) 616-620.

Harvey, J. E., ‘Jehoiachin and Joseph: Hope at the Close of the Deuteronomistic History’, in R. Heskett and B. Irwin (eds.), *The Bible as a Human Witness to Divine Revelation: Hearing the Word of God Through Historically Dissimilar Traditions* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 469; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 51-61.

Hays, J. D., ‘Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11’, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.2 (2003) 149-174.

Heinrich, A., *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids und im Alten Testament* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 401; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009).

Heinsohn, N., *Zwischen Verheißung und Verborgenheit: Studien zur Theologie und Anthropologie der Hagar-Erzählungen in Genesis 16 und 21* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 109; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010).

Hendel, R. S., ‘Serpent נחש’, in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)* (2nd edn.; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln and William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, UK 1999), 744-747.

Hendel, R., Kronfeld, C., and Pardes, I., ‘Gender and Sexuality’, in R. Hendel (ed.), *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods* (Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2010), 71-91.

Hepner, G., ‘Jacob’s Servitude with Laban Reflects Conflicts between Biblical Codes’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003) 185-209.

Hepner, G., *Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel* (Studies in Biblical Literature 78; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2010).

Hess, R. S., ‘Leviticus 10:1: Strange Fire and an Odd Name’, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12 (2002) 187-198.

Heyden, K., ‘Die Sünde Kains: Exegetische Beobachtungen zu Gen 4,1-16’, *Biblische Notizen* 118 (2003) 85-109.

Hobbs, T. R., *2 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 13; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1985).

Holloway, S., ‘What Ship Goes There: The Flood Narrative in the Gilgamesh Epic and Genesis Considered in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Temple

Ideology', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 103 (1991) 328-355.

Holthuis, S., *Intertextualität: Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (Stauffenburg Colloquium 28; Stauffenburg: Tübingen 1993).

Hoop, R. de, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 1998).

Hoop, R. de, '"Then Israel Bowed Himself…" (Genesis 47.31)', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.4 (2004) 467-480.

Houtman, C., *Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 9; Kok Pharos: Kampen 1994).

Howell, A. J., 'The Firstborn Son of Moses as the "Relative of Blood" in Exodus 4.24-26', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35.1 (2010) 63-76.

Hughes, D. D., *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (Routledge: London · New York 1991).

Hurovitz, V. A., 'Who Lost an Earring? Genesis 35:4 Reconsidered', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000) 28-32.

Hutton, J. M., 'Southern, Northern and Transjordanian Perspectives', in F. Stavrakopoulou and J. Barton (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 149-174.

Jacobs, S., 'Instrumental Talion in Deuteronomic Law', *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 16 (2010) 263-278.

Jong, M. M. de, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 117; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007).

Joosten, J., 'Abram et Saraï en Égypte: Composition et message de Genèse 12, 10-20', in M. Arnold, G. Dahan, and A. Noblesse-Rocher (eds.), *La sœur-épouse (Genèse 12, 10-20)* (Études d'histoire de l'exégèse 1; Cerf: Paris 2010), 11-25.

Kaminski, C. M., *From Noah to Israel: Realization of the Primaeval Blessing after the Flood* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 413; T&T Clark: London · New York 2004).

Kessler, J., 'Sexuality and Politics: The Motif of the Displaced Husband in the Books of Samuel', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000) 409-423.

Kim, Y. H., ‘The Jubilee: Its Reckoning and Inception Day’, *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010) 147-151.

King, P. J., ‘Gezer and Circumcision’, in S. Gitin, J. E. Wright, and J. P. Dessel (eds.), *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel*, Festschrift W. G. Dever (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2006), 333-340.

Klein, R. W., *1 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary 10; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1983).

Knauf, E. A., ‘Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten’, in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 101-118.

Knierim, R. P. and Coats, G. W., *Numbers* (Forms of the Old Testament Literature 4; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2005).

Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W. [et al.], *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, vol. 1-2 (3rd edn., E. J. Brill: Leiden · New York · Köln 1995).

Konkel, M., *Sünde und Vergebung: Eine Rekonstruktion der Redaktionsgeschichte der hinteren Sinaiperikope (Exodus 32-34) vor dem Hintergrund aktueller Pentateuchmodelle* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 58; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2008).

Koorevaar, H. L., ‘The Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, and the Macro-Structural Problem of the Pentateuch’, in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 423-453.

Krašovec, J., *The Transformation of Biblical Proper Names* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 418; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010).

Kreuzer, S., ‘Vom Garizim zum Ebal: Erwägungen zur Geschichte und Textgeschichte sowie zu einem neuen Qumran-Text’, in U. Dahmen and J. Schnocks (eds.), *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit: Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität*, Festschrift H.-J. Fabry (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 159; V&R / Bonn University: Göttingen 2010), 31-42.

Kunz, A., ‘Ägypten in der Perspektive Israels am Beispiel der Josefsgeschichte (Gen 37-50)’, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 47 (2003) 206-229.

Kunz-Lübcke, A., ‘Auf dem Stein und zwischen den Zeilen: Überlegungen zu einer kontrafaktischen Geschichte Israels am Beispiel von 2 Kön 3 und der Mescha-Inschrift’, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 51 (2007) 1-22.

Kvanvig, H. S., *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 149; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011).

Lawlor, J. I., ‘The “At-Sinai Narrative”: Exodus 18-Numbers 1’, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21 (2011) 23-42.

Lemański, J., ‘Dawid i Goliat, czyli spór o to, jaki obraz Dawida prezentuje 1 Sm 17, 1-18, 5?’, *Roczniki Biblijne* 2 (2010) 77-121.

Lemański, J., ‘Grób jako znak prawa własności ziemi? Rdz 23 i jego przesłanie teologiczne’, *Roczniki Biblijne* 1 (2009) 127-153.

Lemański, J., *Księga Wyjścia: Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny: Stary Testament 2; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2009).

Lemański, J., ‘Opowiadanie o Arce przymierza (1 Sm 4,1-7,1; 2 Sm 6) jako klucz do teologii Ksiąg Samuela’, *Scriptura Sacra* 11 (2007) 5-31.

Lemche, N. P., ‘Did a Reform like Josiah’s Happen?’, in P. R. Davies and D. V. Edelman (eds.), *The Historian and the Bible*, Festschrift L. L. Grabbe (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 530; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 11-19.

Leuchter, M., ‘The Manumission Laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy: The Jeremiah Connection’, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008) 635-653.

Levin, C., ‘Abraham erwirbt seine Grablege (Genesis 23)’, in R. Achenbach and M. Arneth (eds.), *»Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben« (Gen 18,19): Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie*, Festschrift E. Otto (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 13; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 96-113.

Levinson, B. M., ‘The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History’s Transformation of Torah’, *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001) 511-534.

Linke, W., ‘Spis ludności za Dawida w różnych interpretacjach teologicznych’, *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 47 (2009) 139-166.

Lohfink, N., ‘Bund als Vertrag im Deuteronomium’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 107 (1995) 215-239 [also in id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur*, vol. 4 (Stuttgarter

biblische Aufsatzbände 31; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2000), 285-309].

Lohfink, N., 'Die Erzählung vom Sündenfall', in id., *Das Siegeslied am Schilfmeer: Christliche Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Alten Testament* (J. Knecht: Frankfurt am Main 1965), 81-101.

Lozovyy, J., *Saul, Doeg, Nabal, and the "Son of Jesse": Readings in 1 Samuel 16-25* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 497; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009).

Lyons, M. A., *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 507; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009).

MacDonald, N., 'Listening to Abraham—Listening to Yhwh: Divine Justice and Mercy in Genesis 18:16-33', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004) 25-43.

Machinist, P., 'The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology', in G. Galil, M. Geller, and A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Festschrift B. Oded (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009), 469-531.

Magen, Y., 'The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence', in O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2007), 157-211.

Magen, Y., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2, *A Temple City* (Judea & Samaria Publications 8; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2008).

Magen, Y., Misgav, H., and Tsfania, L., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (Judea & Samaria Publications 2; Israel Antiquities Authority: Jerusalem 2004).

Margalith, O., 'The Riddle of Genesis 14 and Melchizedek', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000) 501-508.

Marx, A., 'Sens et fonction de Gen. xxii 14', *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001) 197-205.

Mathews, K. A., *Genesis 1-11:26* (New American Commentary 1A; Broadman & Holman: [*s.l.*] 1996).

Mathews, K. A., *Genesis 11:27-50:26* (New American Commentary 1B; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2005).

Mayer, W., 'Sennacherib's Campaign of 701 BCE: The Assyrian View', in L. L. Grabbe (ed.), *'Like a Bird in a Cage': The Invasion of Sennacherib*

in 701 BCE (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 363; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2003), 168-200.

Mayfield, T. D., *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.43; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010).

Merecz, R., 'Assyrian-Israelite Dynamics: On the Circumstances Leading to Jehu's Elevation to the Throne', *Roczniki Teologiczne* 54 (2007), fasc. 1, 5-21.

Merrill, E. H., *Deuteronomy* (New American Commentary 4; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 1994).

Mettinger, T. N. D., *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2007).

Meyers, C., *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (Oxford University: New York · Oxford 1988).

Milgrom, J., *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 3; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1991).

Milgrom, J., *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 3B; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 2001).

Miller, G. D., 'Intertextuality in Old Testament Research', *Currents in Biblical Research* 9.3 (2011) 283-309.

Mirguet, F., *La représentation du divin dans les récits du Pentateuque: Méditations syntaxiques et narratives* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 123; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2009).

Moberly, R. W. L., 'On Learning Spiritual Disciplines: A Reading on Exodus 16', in J. G. McConville and K. Möller (eds.), *Reading the Law*, Festschrift G. J. Wenham (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 461; T&T Clark: New York · London 2007), 213-227.

Moberly, R. W. L., *The Theology of the Book of Genesis* (Old Testament Theology; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2009).

Monroe, L. S., *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (Oxford University: Oxford [et al.] 2011).

Montgomery, J. A. and Gehman, H. S. (ed.), *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (International Critical Commentary; T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1951).

Morschauer, S., '"Hospitality", Hostiles and Hostages: On the Legal Background to Genesis 19.1-9', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27.4 (2003) 461-485.

Müller, W. G., 'Interfigurality: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures', in H. F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (Research in Text Theory: Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 15; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 1991), 101-121.

Na'aman, N., 'The "Discovered Book" and the Legitimation of Josiah's Reform', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011) 47-62.

Na'aman, N., 'Does Archaeology Really Deserve the Status of a "High Court" in Biblical Historical Research?', in B. Becking and L. L. Grabbe (eds.), *Between Evidence and Ideology: Essays on the History of Ancient Israel read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap, Lincoln, July 2009* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 59; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011), 165-183.

Naumann, T., 'The Common Basis of the Covenant and the Distinction between Isaac and Ishmael in Gen 17: The Case of Ishmael and the Non-Israelite Descendants of Abraham in the Priestly Source', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 89-109.

Nelson, R. D., *Deuteronomy* (Old Testament Library; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2004).

Ngangura Manyanya, L., *La fraternité de Jacob et d'Esaü (Gn 25-36): Quel frère aîné pour Jacob ?* (Actes et Recherches; Labor et fides: Genève 2009).

Ngangura Manyanya, L., 'Jacob a gagné toute la bénédiction, Ésaü n'a rien perdu: Respect et séparation, un autre modèle de fraternité (Gn 33, 1-17)', *Etudes Théologiques & Religieuses* 85 (2010) 479-498.

Nielsen, K., 'Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible', in A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø (eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2000), 17-31.

Niesiołowski-Spanò, Ł., 'Primeval History in the Persian Period?', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 21 (2007) 106-126.

Nihan, C., *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.25; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2007).

Nihan, C., 'Israel's Festival Calendars in Leviticus 23, Numbers 28-29 and the Formation of "Priestly" Literature', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Le-*

viticus and Numbers (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 177-231.

Nihan, C., 'Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 111-134.

Nodet, É., 'Pâque, Azymes et théorie documentaire', *Revue biblique* 114 (2007) 499-534.

Nodet, É., *Samaritains, Juifs, Temples* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique 74; J. Gabalda: Pendé 2010).

Noegel, S. B., 'Drinking Feasts and Deceptive Feasts: Jacob and Laban's Double Talk', in id. (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (CDL: Bethesda, Md. 2000), 163-179.

Noort, E., 'Genesis 22: Human Sacrifice and Theology in the Hebrew Bible', in E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 4; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2002), 1-20.

Oswald, W., *Israel am Gottesberg: Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 159; Universitätsverlag: Freiburg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 1998).

Oswald, W., 'Die Revision des Edombildes in Numeri xx 14-21', *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000) 218-232.

Otto, E., 'Das Bundesbuch und der "Kodex" Hammurapi: Das biblische Recht zwischen positiver und subversiver Rezeption von Keilinschriftrecht', *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 16 (2010) 1-26.

Otto, E., 'Deuteronomiumstudien I. Die Literaturgeschichte von Deuteronomium 1-3', *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 14 (2008) 86-236 [also as id., 'Deuteronomium 1-3 als Schlüssel der Pentateuchkritik in diachroner und synchroner Lektüre', in id., *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Schriften* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 9; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 284-420].

Otto, E., ‘Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitsgesetz Levitikus 17-26’, in H.-J. Fabry and H.-W. Jüngling (eds.), *Levitikus als Buch* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 119; Philo: Berlin 1999), 125-196 [also in id., *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Schriften* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 9; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2009), 46-106].

Papola, G., *L’alleanza di Moab: Studio esegetico teologico di Dt 28,69-30,20* (Analecta Biblica 174; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2008).

Park, S.-M. S., ‘Transformation and Demarcation of Jacob’s “Flocks” in Genesis 30:25-43: Identity, Election, and the Role of the Divine’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010) 667-677.

Pawłowski, Z., *Opowiadanie, Bóg i początek: Teologia narracyjna Rdz 1-3* (Rozprawy i Studia Biblijne 13; Vocatio: Warszawa 2003).

Peetz, M., *Abigail, die Prophetin: Mit Klugheit und Schönheit für Gewaltverzicht: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu 1 Sam 25* (Forschung zur Bibel 116; Echter: Würzburg 2008).

Peleg, Y., ‘Was the Ancestress of Israel in Danger? Did the Pharaoh Touch (נגע) Sarai?’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 118 (2006) 197-208.

Perlitt, L., *Deuteronomium* [Dtn 1,1-18] (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 5/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990).

Pfeiffer, H., ‘Der Baum in der Mitte des Gartens: Zum überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Ursprung der Paradieserzählung (Gen 2,4b – 3,24), Teil I: Analyse’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000) 487-500.

Pfister, M., ‘Konzepte der Intertextualität’, in U. Broich, M. Pfister, and B. Schulte-Middelich (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 35; Max Niemeyer: Tübingen 1985), 1-30.

Pfoh, E., ‘Genesis 4 Revisited: Some Remarks on Divine Patronage’, *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 23 (2009) 38-45.

Pirson, R., *The Lord of the Dreams: A Semantic and Literary Analysis of Genesis 37-50* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 355; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2002).

Propp, W. C., *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 2; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1998).

Puech, É., ‘La requête d’un moissonneur dans le Sud-Judéen à la fin du VII[e] s. av. J.-C.’, *Revue biblique* 110 (2003) 5-16.

Quesada, J. J., ‘King David and Tidings of Death: “Character Response” Criticism’, in T. Linafelt, C. V. Camp, and T. Beal (eds.), *The Fate of King David: The Past and Present of a Biblical Icon* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 500; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010), 3-18.

Rendtorff, R., *Leviticus*, vol. 1, *Leviticus 1,1 – 10,20* (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 3/1; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004).

Reno, R. R., *Genesis* (Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible; Brazos: Grand Rapids, Mich. 2010).

Richter, S. L., ‘The Place of the Name in Deuteronomy’, *Vetus Testamentum* 57 (2007) 342-366.

Roberts, K. L., ‘God, Prophet, and King: Eating and Drinking on the Mountain in First Kings 18:41’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000) 632-644.

Rofé, A., ‘Clan Sagas As a Source in Settlement Traditions’, in S. M. Olyan and R. C. Culley (eds.), *“A Wise and Discerning Mind”*, Festschrift B. O. Long (Brown Judaic Studies 325; Brown University: Providence, RI 2000), 191-203.

Rofé, A., *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Biblical Seminar 58; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1999).

Römer, T. C., ‘Du Temple au Livre: L’idéologie de la centralisation dans l’historiographie deutéronomiste’, in S. L. McKenzie, T. Römer, and H. H. Schmid (eds.), *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible*, Festschrift J. Van Seters (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 294; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2000), 207-225.

Römer, T. C., ‘L’école deutéronomiste et la formation de la Bible hébraïque’, in id. (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 147; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 2000), 179-193.

Römer, T. C., ‘Israel’s Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers’, in R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker (eds.), *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography*, Festschrift A. G. Auld (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 113; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2007), 419-445.

Rothenbusch, R., *Die kasuistische Rechtssammlung im ‘Bundesbuch’ (Ex 21,2-11.18-22,16) und ihr literarischer Kontext im Licht altorientalischer Parallelen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 259; Ugarit: Münster 2000).

Ruppert, L., *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*, vol. 1, *Gen 1,1 – 11,26* (Forschung zur Bibel 70; Echter: Würzburg 1992); vol. 2, *Gen 11,27 – 25,18* (Forschung zur Bibel 98; Echter: Würzburg 2002); vol. 3, *Gen 25,19 – 36,43* (Forschung zur Bibel 105; Echter: Würzburg 2005); vol. 4, *Gen 37,1 – 50,26* (Forschung zur Bibel 118; Echter: Würzburg 2008).

Ruwe, A., 'Beschneidung als interkultureller Brauch und Friedenszeichen Israels: Religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Genesis 17, Genesis 34, Exodus 4 und Josua 5', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 64 (2008) 309-342.

Ruwe, A., *„Heiligkeitsgesetz" und „Priesterschrift": Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,1-26,2* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 26; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 1999).

Sailhamer, J., 'Genesis', in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: With the New International Version of the Holy Bible*, vol. 2, *Genesis-Numbers* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1990), 1-284.

Sarna, N. M., *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary 1; Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia · New York · Jerusalem 1989).

Schäfer-Lichtenberger, C., 'Frauen im Gespräch mit David – deuteronomistische Zwischenrufe?', in id. (ed.), *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 188; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2010), 132-156.

Schattner-Riesner, U., 'Garizim *versus* Ebal: Ein neues Qumranfragment samaritanischer Tradition?', *Early Christianity* 1 (2010) 277-281.

Schipper, B. U., 'Schlangenbeschwörung in Ägypten und in Israel', in M. Pietsch and F. Hartenstein (eds.), *Israel zwischen den Mächten*, Festschrift S. Timm (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 364; Ugarit: Münster 2009), 419-436.

Schmid, K., *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*, trans. J. D. Nogalski (Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures 3; Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2010).

Schmid, K., 'Die Unteilbarkeit der Weisheit: Überlegungen zur sogenannten Paradieserzählung Gen 2f. und ihrer theologischen Tendenz', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114 (2002) 21-39.

Schmidt, L., 'Die Ansiedlung von Ruben und Gad im Ostjordanland in Numeri 32,1-38', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114 (2002) 497-510.

Schmidt, L., ‘Im Dickicht der Pentateuchforschung: Ein Plädoyer für die umstrittene Neuere Urkundenhypothese’, *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010) 400-420.

Schmidt, L., *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri 10,11-36,13* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 7/2; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004).

Schmitt, H.-C., ‘Die Josephsgeschichte und das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk: Genesis 38 und 48-50’, in M. Vervenne and J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature*, Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 133; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 1997), 391-405.

Schofield, A., ‘Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 *Serekh* Copies’, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008) 96-120.

Schöpflin, K., ‘Jakob segnet seinen Sohn: Genesis 49,1-28 im Kontext von Josefs- und Vätergeschichte’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003) 501-523.

Seebass, H., *Numeri*, vol. 2, *Numeri 10,11 – 22,1* (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 4/2; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2003); vol. 3, *Numeri 22,2 – 36,13* (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament 4/3; Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007).

Sénéchal, V., ‘Quel horizon d’écriture pour Nb 14,11-25? Essai de sondage des soubassements de cette péricope’, in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 215; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Dudley, Mass. 2008), 609-629.

Sénéchal, V., *Rétribution et intercession dans le Deutéronome* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 408; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009).

Shemesh, Y., ‘Rape is Rape is Rape: The Story of Dinah and Shechem (Genesis 34)’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119 (2007) 2-21.

Short, J. R., *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David* (Harvard Theological Studies 63; Harvard University: Cambridge, Mass. 2010).

Ska, J. L., ‘Essai sur la nature et la signification du cycle d’Abraham (Gn 11,27 – 25,11)’, in A. Wénin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 155; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven [et al.] 2001), 153-177 [also as id., ‘Essay on the Nature and Meaning of the Abraham Cycle (Gen 11:29-25:11)’, in id., *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch:*

Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 66; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2009), 23-45].

Ska, J.-L., 'Le genealogie della Genesi e le risposte alle sfide della storia', *Ricerche storico bibliche* 17 (2005) no. 1, 89-111.

Skinner, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (International Critical Commentary; 2nd edn., T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1930).

Smith, H. P., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (International Critical Commentary; T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1899).

Smith, R. G., *The Fate of Justice and Righteousness during David's Reign: Rereading the Court History and Its Ethics according to 2 Samuel 8:15b-20:26* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 508; T&T Clark: New York · London 2009).

Sparks, K. L., '*Enūma Elish* and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007) 625-648.

Sparks, K., 'Genesis 49 and the Tribal List Tradition in Ancient Israel', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 115 (2003) 327-347.

Sparks, K. L., 'Genre Criticism', in T. B. Dozeman (ed.), *Methods for Exodus* (Methods in Biblical Interpretation; Cambridge University: Cambridge [et al.] 2010), 55-94.

Stabryła, W. M., *Któż taki jak JHWH? Analiza porównawcza tekstów Wj 15 i Ps 77* (Series Biblica Paulina 3; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2007).

Stackert, J., *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2007).

Stavrakopoulou, F., *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestral Veneration in Biblical Land Claims* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 473; T&T Clark: New York · London 2010).

Steymans, H. U., 'Gilgameš und Genesis 1-9', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 54 (2010) 201-228.

Stordalen, T., 'Heaven on Earth – Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature', in K. Schmid and C. Riedweg (eds.), *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.34; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2008), 28-57.

Stuart, D. G., *Exodus* (New American Commentary 2; Broadman & Holman: Nashville, Tenn. 2006).

Sweeney, M. A., *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library; Westminster John Knox: Louisville · London 2007).

Szedlàk-Michel, Y., ‘Die Hüter der Lade’, in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke: Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 249; Academic: Fribourg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2011), 152-167.

Szwarc, U., *Przesłanie Rdz 49 i Pwt 33: Studium literacko-egzegetyczno-historyczne* (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski: Lublin 1997).

Tarazi, P. N., *Genesis* (Chrysostom Bible; OCABS: St Paul, Minn. 2009).

Tarazi, P. N., *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, vol. 1, *Historical Traditions* (rev. edn., St Vladimir’s Seminary: Crestwood, NY 2003).

Tigay, J. H., *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary 5; Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia · Jerusalem 1996).

Titus, P. J., *The Second Story of Creation (Gen 2:4-3:24): A Prologue to the Concept of Enneateuch?* (European University Studies 23/912; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011).

Tronina, A., *Księga Kapłańska: Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny: Stary Testament 3; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2006).

Tsumura, D. T., *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 83; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1989).

Tsumura, D. T., *The First Book of Samuel* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. · Cambridge, U.K. 2007).

Van der Kooij, A., ‘The Story of Paradise in the Light of Mesopotamian Culture and Literature’, in K. J. Dell, G. Davies, and Y. V. Koh (eds.), *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms*, Festschrift J. Emerton (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 135; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2010), 3-22.

Van Seters, J., *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind. 2009).

Van Seters, J., *A Law Book for the Diaspora: Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code* (Oxford University: New York [et al.] 2003).

Van Seters, J., ‘Law of the Hebrew Slave: A Continuing Debate’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119 (2007) 169-183.

Van Seters, J., *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1994).

Van Seters, J., *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, Ky. 1992).

Van Seters, J., 'The Religion of the Patriarchs in Genesis', *Biblica* 61 (1980) 220-233.

Van Seters, J., 'The Silence of Dinah (Genesis 34)', in J.-D. Macchi and T. Römer (eds.), *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Ein mehrstimmiger Kommentar zu A Plural Commentary of Gen 25-36*, Festschrift A. de Pury (Le monde de la Bible 44; Labor et Fides: Genève 2001), 239-247.

Veijola, T., 'Der Festkalender des Deuteronomiums (Dtn 16,1-17)', in E. Blum and R. Lux (eds.), *Festtraditionen in Israel und im Alten Orient* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 28; Gütersloher: Gütersloh 2006), 174-189.

Veijola, T., *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 8,1; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2004).

Veijola, T., 'King Og's Iron Bed (Deut 3:11) – Once Again', in P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint*, Festschrift E. Ulrich (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2006), 60-76.

Veijola, T., 'Das Opfer des Abraham – Paradigma des Glaubens aus dem nachexilischen Zeitalter', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 85 (1988) 129-164.

Venema, G. J., *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9-10; 31 – 2 Kings 22-23 – Jeremiah 36 – Nehemiah 8* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 48; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2004).

Vermeylen, J., *La loi du plus fort: Histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel 8 à 1 Rois 2* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 154; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven [et al.] 2000).

Volgger, D., *Und dann wirst du gewiss sterben: Zu den Todesbildern im Pentateuch* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 92; EOS: St. Ottilien 2010).

Vrolijk, P. D., *Jacob's Wealth: An Examination into the Nature and Role of Material Possessions in the Jacob-Cycle (Gen 25:19-35:29)* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 146; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011).

Wagenaar, J. A., 'The Cessation of Manna: Editorial Frames for the Wilderness Wandering in Exodus 16,35 and Joshua 5,10-12', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000) 192-209.

Wagner, D., *Geist und Tora: Studien zur göttlichen Legitimation und Delegitimation von Herrschaft im Alten Testament anhand Erzählungen über König Saul* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 15; Evangelische: Leipzig 2005).

Wagner, V., 'Profanität und Sakralisierung der Beschneidung im Alten Testament', *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010) 447-464.

Wazana, N., 'Are Trees of the Field Human? A Biblical War Law (Deuteronomy 20:19-20) and Neo-Assyrian Propaganda', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Near East*, Festschrift I. Eph'al (Hebrew University Magness: Jerusalem 2008), 274-295.

Weinfeld, M., *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 5; Doubleday: New York [et al.] 1991).

Weinfeld, M., *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 100; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2004).

Weisberg, D. E., 'The Widow of Our Discontent: Levirate Marriage in the Bible and Ancient Israel', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.4 (2004) 403-429.

Wenham, G. J., *Genesis 1-15* (Word Biblical Commentary 1; Word Books: Waco, Tex. 1987).

Wenham, G. J., *Genesis 16-50* (Word Biblical Commentary 2; Word Books: Dallas, Tex. 1994).

Wénin, A., 'Caïn: Un récit mythique pour explorer la violence', in V. Collado Bertomeu (ed.), *Palabra, prodigio, poesía*, Festschrift L. Alonso Schökel (Analecta Biblica 151; Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Roma 2003), 37-53.

Wénin, A., 'Le temps dans histoire de Joseph (Gn 37-50): Repères temporels pour une analyse narrative', *Biblica* 83 (2002) 28-53.

Wesselius, J.-W., *The Origin of the History of Israel: Herodotus's* Histories *as Blueprint for the First Books of the Bible* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 345; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2002).

Willi-Plein, I., 'Barsillai der Gileaditer', in M. Pietsch and F. Hartenstein (eds.), *Israel zwischen den Mächten*, Festschrift S. Timm (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 364; Ugarit: Münster 2009), 455-472.

Williams, M. J., *Deception in Genesis: An Investigation into the Morality of a Unique Biblical Phenomenon* (Studies in Biblical Literature 32; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2001).

Willis, T. M., *Leviticus* (Abington Old Testament Commentaries; Abington: Nashville 2009).

Wilson, R. R., *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (Yale Near Eastern Researches 7; Yale University: New Haven · London 1977).

Wöhrle, J., '*dominium terrae*: Exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zum Herrschaftsauftrag in Gen 1,26-28', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 121 (2009) 171-188.

Wöhrle, J., 'The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision', in R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Near East* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16; Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden 2011), 71-87.

Wong, G. T. K., 'Is There a Direct Pro-Judah Polemic in Judges?', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 19 (2005) 84-110.

Wright, D. P., *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi* (Oxford University: New York 2009).

Wright, D. P., 'Music and Dance in 2 Samuel 6', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002) 201-225.

Yamada, F. M., *Configurations of Rape in the Hebrew Bible: A Literary Analysis of Three Rape Narratives* (Studies in Biblical Literature 109; Peter Lang: New York [et al.] 2008).

Zadok, R., 'Neo-Assyrian Notes', in M. Cogan and D. Kahn (eds.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Near East*, Festschrift I. Eph'al (Hebrew University Magness: Jerusalem 2008), 312-330.

Zehnder, M., 'Building on Stone? Deuteronomy and Esarhaddon's Loyalty Oaths (Part 1): Some Preliminary Observations', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009) 341-374.

Zenger, E., 'Theorien über die Entstehung des Pentateuch im Wandel der Forschung', in id. [et al.], *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 1,1; 7th edn., W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2008).

Ziegler, Y., *Promises to Keep: The Oath in Biblical Narrative* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 120; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2008).

Ziemer, B., *Abram – Abraham: Kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Genesis 14, 15 und 17* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 350; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2005).

Index of ancient sources

Leviticus

Numbers

2 Samuel

2 Kings

Ezekiel

Greek

Israelite–Jewish

European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

Vol. 1 Bartosz Adamczewski: Retelling the Law. Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy. 2012.

www.peterlang.de

Bartosz Adamczewski

The Gospel of the Narrative 'We'

The Hypertextual Relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles

Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien, 2010.
168 pp.
ISBN 978-3-631-60505-9 · hardback € 41,80*

The work analyses the current state of research on the problem of the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptic Gospels. It proves that the Fourth Gospel, which was written c. AD 140–150, is a result of systematic, sequential, hypertextual reworking of the Acts of the Apostles with the use of the Synoptic Gospels, more than ten other early Christian writings, Jewish sacred Scriptures, and Josephus' works. The work also demonstrates that the character of the 'disciple whom Jesus loved' functions in the Fourth Gospel as a narrative embodiment of all generations of the Pauline, post-Pauline, and post-Lukan Gentile Christian Church. These features of the Fourth Gospel imply that it was intended to crown and at the same time close the canon of the New Testament writings.

Content: The problem of literary dependence of the Fourth Gospel on the Synoptic Gospels · The Acts of the Apostles as a structuring hypotext of the Fourth Gospel · The Fourth Gospel as a hypertextual reworking of the Acts of the Apostles, of the Synoptic Gospels, and of other early Christian works · The identity of the 'disciple whom Jesus loved'

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien
Distribution: Verlag Peter Lang AG
Moosstr. 1, CH-2542 Pieterlen
Telefax 00 41 (0) 32 / 376 17 27
E-Mail info@peterlang.com